DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 138 JC 820 392

AUTHOR	Atwell, Charles A.; And Others
TITLE	Reexamining Community Services in the Community College: Toward Consensus and Commitment. Topical Paper Number 76.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Los Angeles, Calif.; National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	82
CONTRACT	400-78-0038
NOTE	92p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Planning; *College Role; *Community Colleges; *Community Services; Curriculum Development; Educational History; *Educational Objectives; Financial Support; Leadership; *Program Development; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

In an effort to reinforce the central role of community services in the comprehensive community college, this monograph examines the history, mission, role, and funding of community services and provides recommendations for continuing and increasing the integration of such services within the community college. Chapter I provides a historical overview of the public service mission of higher education in the United States. Then, Chapter II examines community services in relation to other college missions and argues for a clear definition of community services, a reexamination of its mission, and the development of a consensus and commitment to its continuation by the college community and policy makers. After Chapter III discusses the development of community service programs, ways of bringing them into the mainstream of the college, and the advantages of developing a central theme for community services and the college, Chapter IV outlines the funding practices of various states and suggests alternative sources of funding for community service programs. Chapter V identifies the role of institutional, local, and state leaders in gaining widespread commitment to the community service function. Finally, Chapter VI offers recommendations for the establishment of priorities, an operational definition of community services, and a uniform system of data collection; for the development of a curriculum-based program of services and activities; and for the adoption of a more active stance on the question of community services. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

REEXAMINING COMMUNITY SERVICES IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: TOWARD CONSENSUS AND COMMITMENT

By
Charles A. Atwell
George B. Vaughan
W. Robert Sullins

ED220138

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

■ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

□ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 820 392

Topical Paper Number 76

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
and
National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education

Topical Paper No. 76

REEXAMINING COMMUNITY SERVICES IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: TOWARD CONSENSUS AND COMMITMENT

Charles A. Atwell
George B. Vaughan
W. Robert Sullins
of the
National Council on Community Services
and Continuing Education

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library, UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90024
(213) 825-3931

Summer, 1982

Table of Contents

	Page
Foreword	i
Information About the Clearinghouse	ii
Preface	iii
Chapters	
1. American Higher Education's Public Service Mission	1
2. Community Service and the Community College: An Overview	9
3. Program Development and the Evolving Mission	21
4. Funding Community Services: An Expression of Commitment?	36
5. Leadership: Requisite for Success	55
6. Summary and Recommendations	67
Footnotes	74
References	78

Cover designed by Nancy Mattice.

This publication may be reproduced at will for further distribution. Single copies available free on request from the Clearinghouse while supply lasts.

FOREWORD

The past two decades have provided many challenges for community colleges, especially in defining the role and scope of community services, and integrating it into the organizational structure.

While community services has been successful in the acceptance of its mission, it is imperative that practitioners resist a contented resting upon past accomplishments. Our constituents are turning to us in increasing numbers for assistance and answers, as they are confronted by their individual economic, employment, social, and survival needs.

Reexamining Community Services in the Community College: Toward Consensus and Commitment provides us with a strong philosophical base for strengthening our role, and offers practical suggestions and information.

There is no doubt that Charles A. Atwell and W. Robert Sullins of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and George B. Vaughan, Jr. of Piedmont Virginia Community College have authored an excellent publication reexaming community services and its mission. The National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education (NCCSCE) extends our sincere appreciation to them for their dedicated efforts and thought-provoking dialogue. Their purpose is not to arrive at a definition, which will apply to only selected programs, but to explore the role of community services in community colleges.

Gary Kai Lemke
President
National Council on Community Services
and Continuing Education

July, 1982

Information About the Clearinghouse

ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) is a nationwide information network, sponsored by the National Institute of Education, for the collection and dissemination of information about education. Since 1966, ERIC has operated through 16 subject-specialized clearinghouses, each responsible for providing access to the literature of education in its scope area.

ERIC/JC (the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges) is located at UCLA. It specializes in information about all aspects of two-year college education. Included in our collection are published and unpublished materials on public and private community and junior colleges, technical institutes, and two-year branch university campuses. These materials cover administration, faculty, students, instruction, curricula, support services, libraries, and community education.

Mailing List. Our quarterly Bulletin will keep you apprised of Clearinghouse activities and publications. Write to us and receive it free. Our address is 96 Powell Library, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90024. Phone: (213) 825-3931.

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education under contract no. 400-78-0038. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of NIE.

PREFACE

We are pleased to have been asked to prepare this monograph, the first in a planned series co-sponsored by the National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education (NCCSCE) and the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. During our professional careers we have observed community services evolve to the point of widespread acceptance as one of the principal missions of the community college. The golden years of the 1960s, and even the so-called "sobering seventies" saw steady, even dramatic, growth in these activities. The seventies spawned COMBASE, for example, and the excellent statement on the "community renewal" college by James Gollattscheck and others (1976).

Now, at a time when the conceptual base for community services is reasonably well established and when the demand and need for community services programming is at an all-time high, community services is threatened on a number of fronts. Those who seek to narrow the comprehensive mission view community services as a nonessential activity. In the absence of state financial support, community services administrators in most states are forced to become entrepreneurs as they seek to make community services fully self-supporting. These and other pressures cause programmers to be concerned more about the financial soundness of a particular activity than about its educational value as a partial solution to personal or community problems. And the leadership of the community college frequently exhausts its energy on other pressing problems before it gets to the issues surrounding community services programs.

We believe that community services belong in the forefront of the community college program. We matured in this business during the boom years of the late 1960s and early 1970s at a time when "all things to all people"

appeared not only philosophically attractive but also financially and politically feasible. Emotionally, we would still like to feel that way; realistically, we doubt that society is either able or willing to pick up the tab so that the community college can, to borrow from the U.S. Army's advertising agency, "be all that it can be."

Even in a time of reduced resources, we view community services as a mainline activity. Managers may have to seek new and varied funding sources; colleges may well have to do a better job of relating community services activities to their curricular programs; and we may all have to constantly remind insiders and outsiders alike that community services "belong."

We hope this monograph is useful to community services professionals who are seeking ideas about how to be more effective, to their colleagues in the community college who want to know and understand more about community services, and to the decision makers who, in large measure, will determine the direction of community services in the years ahead.

We are indebted to NCCSCE for its continuing leadership in community services and for the opportunity to share our thoughts on this topic with the profession. We owe special thanks to the publications committee of the Council--Gary Lemke, Bob Rue, Tony Cotoia, and Douglas Kelley--and to Brian Donnelly, who conceived the idea of the "Challenge" series during his term as President of NCCSCE. Donald S. Karvelis, Community Service Coordinator at Cerritos College (CA), reviewed the manuscript. Arthur Cohen and his colleagues at the ERIC Clearinghouse have been most cooperative. We want to recognize especially Gayle Byock who has worked closely with the Council and who supported and encouraged us from start to finish.

Charles A. Atwell
George B. Vaughan
W. Robert Sullins

Chapter 1
AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION'S PUBLIC SERVICE MISSION

The notion of public service is inbred in American democracy. Ranging from George Washington's belief in the citizen-soldier to the common school of colonial New England, the idea of service to the nation and the community was an accepted and desirable activity early in the nation's history. Since public schooling emerged as the backbone of America's brand of democracy, it was only natural that those interested in education would view the promotion of service as a legitimate educational concern.

The concept of service emerged as one part of a threefold mission for higher education. Joining teaching and research, public or community service[1] became America's unique stamp on the university and much of the rest of American higher education. As Brubacher and Rudy put it, that part of American higher education's mission devoted to teaching borrowed heavily from the English college, while research owes its origin to the German university model. Finally, the idea of public of community service grew out of the American idea that "higher education to justify its own existence should seek actively the basic needs of American life" (1968, p. 394).

Today, the threefold mission remains the philosophical base of higher education operation, although the lines among the three thrusts are less taunt than in the past. As more and more people participate in higher education and since higher education, through research, originates, preserves, and transmits knowledge, both teaching and public service have changed. For example, a new theory of economics born in a university graduate school is likely to show up in undergraduate teaching

and be put into operation at the national level, thereby contributing to the public service mission of the university. Moreover, an educated population defines public service in a different way than would a less sophisticated society.

Public service emanating from higher education comes in many configurations and is subject to numerous definitions. Regardless of its form or descriptive terminology, public service consists primarily of sharing the resources of the institution with the public for the public good. Within this broad concept, one can fit such varied activities as cancer research, a professor's serving as a president's cabinet member, and a community college course on energy conservation. Moreover, the definition comfortably encompasses the agricultural extension service, evening classes for adults, and any number of activities that transcend the traditional role associated with undergraduate and graduate teaching and research.

While a detailed history of public service is not possible nor desirable in the few pages this chapter devotes to the subject, it nevertheless appears worthwhile to sketch briefly some of the thinking that has influenced American higher education's devotion to the concept of service to the community. The brief overview, although primarily devoted to the expansion of institutional offerings rather than to individual service, should provide some basis for viewing community services in the community college, the subject of the other chapters in this volume.

Early Concepts

Thomas Jefferson, the chief proponent of public education among America's founding fathers, envisioned a plan of education that extended beyond the classical studies which marked an educated man of his day. In his design for the University of Virginia, Jefferson wanted public lectures to be a part of the University's

offerings and felt "these lectures should be given in the evening, so as not to interrupt the labors of the day" and wanted the lectures to "be maintained wholly at the public expense" (Vaughan, 1980, p. 9). Dumas Malone and Merrill D. Peterson, two of the nation's leading Jefferson scholars, see Jefferson as someone who probably condoned finding practical solutions to the problems of the day by applying formal learning and who would have endorsed the concept of offering adults an opportunity to upgrade their skills by attending evening school (Vaughan, 1980, p. 6-10).

Jefferson, who loved to experiment with new farming methods, would likely have viewed the agricultural extension service as a desirable form of public service. Certainly the seeds of the relationship between higher education and a broad interpretation of public service are found in the thinking of Jefferson (Rudolph, 1962, p. 365).

The Morrill Act of 1862

The Morrill Act of 1862 had profound impact on the concept of public service in American higher education. While the act was designed primarily to promote the agricultural and mechanical arts, the philosophical foundation of the land-grant college provided the basis for an expanded concept of public service. The land-grant colleges would "reduce higher education to the lowest terms and give it the widest extension. In these literal people's colleges, instruction was to be adjusted to the average district school standards" (Ross, 1942, p. 89). These colleges broadened the base of higher education considerably, for they "reached a stratum of students for whom higher or even intermediate training would not otherwise have been available" (Ross, 1942, p. 133).

In addition to teaching subjects previously excluded from higher education, the land-grant institution transformed approaches to higher education as well. Courses were offered both on and off campus.

The traditional dogma that collegiate training--aside from the professionals for which it was the true introduction--must all be at a certain level, must continue through the quadrennial cycle, and must result in certified parchments that represented a standard, in subject matter and graduation, that kept within a minimum range of tolerance, was now being challenged by new degrees. (Ross, 1942, p. 152).

But the regular courses were not serving the masses. "There was a persistent conviction within and without the institutions that the talent and facilities of these people's colleges should be more widely applied, that skilled farmers and mechanics as well as expert leaders should be trained" (Ross, 1942, p. 162).

The result was the establishment of nondegree courses for farmers, dairymen, and persons in skills areas--no matter what their formal education level--who might profit from contact with the institutions (Ross, 1942, p. 162-163). The land-grant college took education to the people through regional meetings held by itinerant lecturers and by making new findings available for the farm and home through the publishing of bulletins and correspondence (Ross, 1942, p. 166). Gradually, the land-grant colleges moved more and more into the concept of public service as exemplified in the university extension movement of the twentieth century.

Popularizing Movements

The university extension service, initiated during the 1890s, brought education to the people on a scale yet unknown in America. Preceding, concomitant with, and contributing to the extension concept was the Chautauqua movement, a movement that was "a response to an unspoken demand, a sensitive alertness to the cravings of millions of people for 'something better'" (Gould, 1961, p. vii).

The Chautauqua movement, founded in 1874 in New York at Lake Chautauqua, spread over the country as a loosely coordinated adult education movement. In 1888, Chautauqua College was founded on the twin ideas of correspondence courses and degrees by mail (Blum and others, 1965, p. 454). The Chautauqua movement popularized such ideas as university extension courses, summer sessions, and a potpourri of courses designed to enlighten the citizenry. More important, perhaps, was the influence the Chautauqua movement exerted on William Rainey Harper[2] and ultimately on the Wisconsin idea.[3] Harper taught at Chautauqua, and was named principal of the College of Liberal Arts in 1877 (Gould, 1961, p. 21). But he had bigger worlds to conquer.

In 1891, Harper became the first president of the newly founded University of Chicago. He brought with him to Chicago the idea of the university extension service, a carryover from the Chautauqua-type lectures, a movement destined to play a major role in shaping the belief that the university should take education to the people. At Chicago, Harper also developed a number of programs of service to society which were built on the belief that knowledge should be used to better mankind, the philosophy of Jefferson and of the Morrill Act. From the founding of the University of Chicago, a broadened concept of public service has remained implanted as a part of the mission of American higher education.

The Wisconsin Idea

Building on the ideas of public service practiced by the land-grant colleges and advocated by Harper, the University of Wisconsin lifted to new heights the idea of service to all segments of the community. The idea "that a state-supported university should contribute directly to improved farming, more efficient industry, and better government" was included in the University of Wisconsin's founding philosophy in 1848 (Brubacher

and Rudy, 1968, p. 165). Moreover, Charles R. Van Hise, president during the height of the Wisconsin Idea's influence, was himself influenced greatly by William Rainey Harper and was highly impressed with "Harper's Chautauqua ideas of bringing a university to all the people by extending its direct influence far beyond its own campus" (Brubacher and Rudy, 1968, p. 166).

The Wisconsin Idea reached its peak during the Progressive Era in American politics. The bond between the university and the state was so strong that not only did university personnel draft and administer regulations, but they also staffed the regulatory commissions (Rudolph, 1962, p. 362). Echoing sentiments expressed earlier by Jefferson, "The Wisconsin Idea . . . rested on the conviction that informed intelligence when applied to the problems of modern society could make democracy work more effectively" (Rudolph, 1962, p. 363).

By 1910, the extension movement was so great that it gained additional tax support for state institutions (Rudolph, 1962, p. 364). More importantly, the extension movement and the other reforms advocated by Harper and Van Hise embedded themselves in the fabric of American higher education to such a degree that their concept of what constituted public service was to have a lasting impact.

Public and Community Service Today

A cursory review of today's college and university course and curriculum offerings reveals that the idea of what constitutes public service activities and offerings far exceeds even the wildest dreams of the early advocates of the concept. As one source puts it, "American higher education has done everything from providing a marriage market for nubile females to producing the atomic bomb" (Hofstadter and Hardy, 1952, p. 107).

Partly as a result of expanded institutional offerings, especially during the evening, part-time adult students

during the 1970s attended institutions of higher education at a rate unprecedented in the history of higher education. The influx of part-time students has continued unabated into the 1980s. In many institutions, and especially in community colleges, activities defined as community services are not only integral to the college's offerings but often serve more people than do degree courses. But what does public service consist of today?

Considering public services in terms of offerings to the public rather than in terms of research and individual public service, one can almost be assured that anything goes. Indeed, one can name practically any subject and find a university or college that will offer a lecture, seminar, workshop, course, or curriculum on the subject. No topic is too esoteric or taboo to be dealt with through some institution's public service division. The gamut has been run.

The nation's public community colleges continue to be in the middle of and often leading the movement toward providing more and more services to more and more people. The majority of these colleges include in their mission a commitment to community services. Moreover, it has often been in the name of community services that community colleges have changed over the years to such a degree that many appear to be losing their identity with higher education. Indeed, many community colleges have bought and advocated the "supermarket" approach to higher education, an approach that permits and encourages community colleges to offer courses in "Building Your Own Front Porch," "Sunday School Teaching," and "Surviving a Nuclear Attack." Noncredit activities (and in some cases credit activities) are offered in belly dancing, poodle grooming, and dealing blackjack. The list of community services in today's community colleges are limited only by the seemingly unlimited imagination of the college's community services director.

One result of the community college's devotion to community services is the shaping of a mission that is not well understood by the public and one that legislators question more and more. Another result is that community services activities of many community colleges are viewed as self-serving, a stance that is in direct opposition to the concept of public service.

On the other hand, community service as practiced by the community college has brought education to the people on such a grand scale that today community colleges, not land-grant institutions, are considered to be the "people's college." Moreover, some commentators have viewed the local community college not only as an educational institution but as a solver of community problems.

Is the supermarket approach to community services a self-serving one that only tends to cloud the community college's mission? Or is the community college truly the people's college and the community's savior? The truth lies somewhere between these extremes. In any event, the community college with its broad interpretation of and devotion to community services is here to stay.

Chapter 2
COMMUNITY SERVICES AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: AN OVERVIEW[4]

Early on, junior college leaders saw the need for education to play a greater role in meeting the ever-broadening needs of the individual and the community. Leonard V. Koos, an early champion of the junior college, stated in 1925 that one purpose of a junior college was to offer courses adapted to local needs, whether the needs were vocational or social. Koos felt that the junior college should affect the cultural level of its community (1925, p. 27). Walter Crosby Eells, as early as 1931, identified service to the community as an important function of the junior college. Eells saw community services as meeting "community needs as distinguished from those of the youth who compose its (the junior college's) regular student body" (Eells, 1931, p. 235). The movement from the junior college of Koos and Eells to the comprehensive community college gained momentum by the end of World War II. The concept of community services was not lost in the transition.

The President's Commission on Higher Education in 1947 admonished the colleges and the universities to "cease to be campus-based. It must take the . . . college to the people wherever they are to be found and by every effective means for communication of ideas and the stimulation of intellectual curiosity. It must not hold itself above using all the arts of persuasion to attract consumers for the services it offers" (Higher Education for American Democracy, I, 1948, p. 97). Jesse P. Bogue, writing from the vantage point of the office of the executive secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges and influenced greatly by the report of the President's Commission, entitled his 1950 work The Community College. Espousing a strong commitment to

many functions now viewed as community services, Bogue stated, "The thesis of the author is that adult education is fully justified by the same fundamental reasons that justify education for any age, group, or class of people." As early as 1950 Bogue saw community services (although he did not use the term) as "an emerging concept for the community college. . . . Under the adult-educational plan, the needs of the community are not only served but they are also served as long as the people wish to learn" (Bogue, 1950, p. 215). The stage was set for someone to place the philosophy of community services in the community college within a framework that would facilitate the inclusion of community services as an integral part of the community college mission.

By the late 1960s community colleges were riding the crest of a growth period that at one stage saw new community colleges opening at the rate of one a week. In 1969 two works were published that did much to define community services within the context of the modern-day public community college; Ervin L. Harlacher's The Community Dimension of the Community College and Gunder A. Myran's Community Services in the Community College. Both Myran and Harlacher strongly advocated a stretching of the community college mission to include community services, not as an adjunct to the operation of the college but as a function central to its mission. Both synthesized much of the thinking regarding community services in the community college; the authors provided definitions of community services; and, more importantly, both Harlacher and Myran provided a framework whereby community services could be an equal partner (along with the regular instruction program and student services) in the community college mission.

The National Council on Community Services for Community and Junior Colleges was also founded in 1969. The Council, which later changed its name to the

National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education (NCCSCE), is an affiliate Council of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. With the formation and development of the NCCSCE and the publication in 1971 of its own journal, The Community Services Catalyst, community services had its national forum.

In spite of a proud history, national spokesmen, and a national organization, community services is often misunderstood and viewed as something of a stepchild on a number of community college campuses. Stepchild status and misunderstanding exist even though many of the proposals currently advocated by community college leaders such as Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. (1980), former president of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, seemingly would have thrust community services to a central, if not a vanguard, position in the community college mission. Given the impetus to move into a significant role at the forefront, why has community services failed to reach that status?

The Evolving Mission

The thesis of this volume is that community services is not currently achieving its full potential because of the failure of community college educators to establish clearly the role of community services in relationship to today's college mission. This failure has resulted notwithstanding the historical precedent that clearly established a mission of community services for higher education in general and for the community college in particular. Moreover, this failure has resulted even though many of the characteristics (e.g. community-centered, client centered, part-time, off-campus, non-credit, special group instruction, evening instruction, adult education, avocational, recreational) once associated with community services no longer distinguish community services alone but are now accepted as important and

necessary in defining the community college mission as a whole. Part of the problem is that community services, while enjoying the success of having most community colleges committed to its function, has failed to reestablish its own mission based on past successes and in light of today's situation. In the search for its proper role, community services proponents have failed to update the conceptual and philosophical work done by such synthesizers as well as by Harlacher, Myran, and others, or have failed to follow the lead of those who have tried, such as Karvelis (1978). Instead community college leaders, not guided by a coherent framework, have cast in almost all directions to find the proper role for community services. The resulting situation is one that often produces frustration, confusion, and a constant search for the perfect definition or "proper" thrust for community services.

Several factors have worked against the view that community services is central to the college's mission. Among the factors are the following: (1) a preoccupation with definitions on the part of those concerned with community services; (2) burgeoning enrollments which have provided community services with the luxury of offering a potpourri of courses with little or no relationship to each other or to the rest of the college program; (3) the failure to utilize fully leadership by community services proponents on individual campuses; (4) the failure to build a sound funding base; and, (5) the often diverse messages from national leaders such as Gleazer and the presidents of the colleges. What is now needed is a reexamination of the community services function in terms of today's mission of the community college, a consensus about the reexamined mission, and a commitment to accomplish that mission.

Definitions, Definitions, Definitions . . .

From reading the literature and from listening to discussions on the subject, one gets the impression that if community services could be defined, its role would be clear. Acknowledging the value of defining one's terms and admitting that a definition often serves as a cornerstone for understanding and articulating the mission of an undertaking, we nevertheless must spend more effort reestablishing the broader role of community services and less time searching for a narrow definition to suit the needs of a diverse group of colleges. Sampling the literature and talking with community services leaders suggests, however, that a search for the definition of community services will continue.

Myran offered a rather fluid definition of community services in 1969: community services would normally meet those needs not met by formal collegiate degree or certificate programs. He even lists educational approaches that are "more" and "less" likely to be identified as community services (Myran, p. 113). Harlacher devoted some space in his 1969 publication to discussing the definitions of community services given by community college spokesmen such as Leland Medsker and B. Lamar Johnson. He also provided a good analysis of the confusion surrounding the term "community services." His own definition emphasizes the role community services plays in the college's offerings in addition to the regularly scheduled day and evening classes (Harlacher, p. 11-15).

Professional associates of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges have considered the role of community services in the community college. They too have found it necessary to develop definitions. Arthur M. Cohen wrote that "Community services...enjoy the dubious distinction of being the community college function least coherently defined, least likely to have finite goals, least

amenable to assessment of effect" (Cohen, 1972, p. 7). Cohen also notes that community services lack a philosophy and consequently have substituted a mode of operation where everyone is accepted into the community services program.

John Lombardi performed the task of sifting through the various definitions of community services and presenting them in a useful format. His 1978 analysis shows that little agreement on what constitutes community services in the community college has been made since Harlacher's 1969 work (Lombardi, 1978b). If anything, the definition of community services was murkier in 1978 than in 1969.

Florence Brawer, the third professional associate of ERIC, tackled perhaps the most difficult task--attempting to reach an understanding of community services through definitions. Brawer has worked through the tedious task of breaking down and separating the various program components that impinge upon each other (i.e. continuing education, adult education, lifelong learning). Her work contributes significantly toward exposing the problems associated with understanding community services as an intellectual concept. Brawer also sets forth a classification which, if adopted, would provide a framework for defining community college education (Brawer, 1980). It uses the students' intentions as the basis for classifying the courses.

A final note on definitions. The Executive Committee of the National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education, at its meeting in Danvers, Massachusetts (October 19-20, 1980), addressed an agenda item relating to a clarification of community services. Needless to say, a good definition requires further study, and the topic will undoubtedly appear on a future agenda of the Executive Committee.

We will not here present a definitive definition of the community services function. Instead, we believe that each system of community colleges, while drawing on the many elements common to community services nationally, should decide for itself what constitutes community services. Once definitions are acceptable, colleges can get on with the business of determining how community services fit into the context of the college's mission.

Enrollments

Total headcount enrollment in credit courses in the nation's two-year institutions in the fall of 1981 was nearly 4.9 million persons. According to the most recent data available (Yarrington, 1982), the number of people reported to be enrolled in noncredit activities during 1980-81 was over four million (the actual number was much higher). Since most of the noncredit enrollment was recruited, serviced, and taught through community services programs, the success of such programs in terms of people served has been overwhelming. While enjoying the success of numbers, community services has remained on the periphery of the main mission of most community colleges, namely that of offering occupational-technical and transfer courses and programs and of providing the student services that support them.

Many faculty members who teach in degree and certificate programs often neither know nor care about what is taking place in the community services program. While exceptions always exist, and while certain community services programs such as art shows or concerts have high visibility on almost all campuses, the fact remains that community services is something many faculty members and administrators tend to accept, at best, as a nice thing for the college to be doing.

Community Services Leadership

The first issues of The Community Services Catalyst (Winter, 1971) asked rhetorically, "Should There Be Community College Community Service Administrators?" Some ten years later, the role of the community services administrator is rightfully a concern to those persons responsible for developing effective community services programs. While some colleges classify the community services administrator as a dean who reports directly to the president of the college, a number of community services administrators (some with the title of dean) do not report directly to the college's chief executive officer. Community services administrators in some states, such as Virginia, do not use the title of dean and report directly to the academic dean. According to one study, the college presidents and academic deans in the Virginia community college system do not wish to change the current practice (Glass and Andrew, 1979).

Adding a dean of community services to an already top-heavy administrative structure is an unrealistic expectation of small and medium-sized colleges. (Some small colleges are reducing the number of deans by combining instruction and student services under one dean.) On the other hand, it is unrealistic to think that community services can move into a major position of leadership nationally if the person responsible for the community services program locally cannot win strong support on his/her own campus. Community services need to have a campus advocate in a top position, be it president, vice president, academic dean, or dean of community services.

Funding

Funding of community services has been and remains, a concern of community college leaders. In many states, noncredit courses must be self-supporting. In Virginia, a 30 percent overhead cost is added to th

direct cost of noncredit courses. In California, the state that has led the nation in community service activities, the passage of Proposition 13 changed the financial outlook. For example, the funds budgeted in 1978-1979 for community services in California were reduced by nearly 24 million dollars, or 62 percent from the previous year. These budget reductions caused fees for community services courses to rise 80 percent (Ireland and Feuers-Jones, 1980, pp. 1-2).

If community services in most states are to continue to be fully or partly self-supporting, expansion of community services in the community college's mission remains less than propitious. One writer's advice in 1973 still rings true: "With the squeeze of inflation, colleges are under constant pressure to accomplish more with less money; no program or activity is secure, least of all community services" (Evans, 1973, p. 17).

Mixed Signals

Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. is generally acknowledged as the nation's leading advocate for utilizing the resources of the community college to solve community problems. In his book The Community College: Values, Vision and Vitality (1980), Gleazer argues that the community college should serve as the nexus of a community learning system. Included in the system would be schools, colleges, libraries, television stations, theaters, parks, a variety of clubs, and trade unions--the list goes on. Gleazer feels that the community college is qualified to play the nexus role because many community college students are full-time workers and at the same time fill such civic roles as officers in unions, board members of libraries or the YMCA, and so on. Also fostering the nexus role are many of the community college's part-time faculty who work as lawyers, real estate brokers, craftsmen, and in other trades and professions that serve to open the doors between the

community and the community college. As Gleazer puts it, "Through its vertical connection in the educational hierarchy and its horizontal relationship with other community agencies, the community college can literally be the middle man (Gleazer, 1980, p. 11).

If the community college performs the linking function to the degree envisioned by Gleazer, it seems obvious that much of the responsibility for coordinating the activities of the various community agencies will fall under the purview of the community services division. But community services administrators are receiving other signals that may influence how much effort may be given to performing the nexus function.

As competition for both full- and part-time students increases, and as college administrations receive constant pressure to continue to grow in what is predicted to be a no-growth period, community services administrators are often not unduly concerned with performing a nexus function. Instead, the president of the local college often calls for the community services division to produce (or at least to identify) only credit students who will contribute to the funding base of the college; this stance often contradicts many community services activities. As one writer notes, a common solution to the funding problem is to convert as many community services activities as possible into credit courses (Lombardi, 1978a, p. 25). However, more recent activities in many states are undoing this tendency as state-level boards set more stringent criteria for credit courses.

With the philosophy set forth by Gleazer placing the community service functions in the mainstream of the college's mission and, at the same time, with the insistence of the local campus and administration for more and more credit courses, community services administrators are receiving contradictory signals. Moreover, as community services administrators interpret the various

signals, they must be careful not to alienate the faculty who teach in the degree programs. Any attempt on the part of community services to convert the college into anything other than an institution of "higher" education will meet with resistance from those faculty members who have committed themselves to teaching in disciplines with the goals of awarding recognized college credits and degrees. Just as they must work to define community services, the local campus leaders need to work more closely with the community services division to sift through the various messages from other units of the college and to set priorities for the local campus.

Reexamining the Mission

The foregoing has suggested the following: that the concept of community services has a long and accepted history in higher education in general and in the community college in particular; that although much time and energy has been devoted to defining community services, no universally accepted definition exists; that certain leaders in the community college field have articulated a philosophy of community services and have set forth a framework whereby that philosophy can be incorporated into the community college mission; that funding and leadership for community services have been and continue to be a problem; that national and campus leaders often send conflicting signals to the community services leadership; and, finally, that community services has not achieved its full potential in part because community services has not been developed within the context of the total college community. As a result, the community services mission in today's community college should be reexamined to create an environment for its fulfillment; upon reexamination, the community services division should seek consensus and commitment within the college community and among local, state, and national policymakers.

Conclusion

As community college leaders seek to reestablish the community services mission, they should realize that many of the activities once considered to be the domain of community services have been absorbed into the regular instructional program. For example, community services served as the catalyst on many campuses for bringing part-time students to the community college. Part-time students now outnumber full-time students and are vital to the very survival of much of the instructional program. Community services leaders were also instrumental in bringing older women and minorities into the community college's instructional program; these, too, are now integrated into the instructional mainstream. Community services administrators have long advocated offering specialized courses for industry. Today, with the thrust toward occupational-technical education, the regular instructional program offers not only specialized courses for industry but degrees for industry as well. Other examples abound of community services being adopted by the community college's instructional program.

Community services leaders can pursue one of two courses of action: they can point to their accomplishments with pride and settle for the minor role of initiating, advocating, and developing aspects of the college's mission that are carried on by other units of the college; or, they themselves can foster their accomplishments, draw upon a rich history of community services in higher education, and seek to establish community services in higher education as a unique and vital part of the community college mission. If they choose the latter course, they must remember that the primary mission of a community college is educational; how community services is integrated into this mission may not only determine the future of community services but of the community college in general.

Chapter 3
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND THE EVOLVING MISSION

The democratization of higher education in America reached new heights during the 1970s when literally millions of working adults began attending college on a part-time basis. Unprecedented in the numbers served, the adult education movement of the past decade carried the idea of citizen education to new heights. In the center of the movement, and in many cases leading the charge to meet the demands of these "new" students, were the nation's community colleges.

The large number of adults enrolling in community colleges changed the makeup of the student bodies at these institutions. Older and more experienced than the typical full-time student, these part-time students viewed their role as citizen as primary and their student role as secondary, thus reversing the age-old concept of the student-citizen. Committed to learning rather than to a particular college, these adults returned to college for any number of reasons--to learn a new skill, to improve a skill, to meet new people, to improve the quality of life, to get out of the house--the list is virtually endless. Regardless of why they enroll, most adults view college attendance as a means of adding a new dimension to their lives.

Often the adults attending community colleges enroll in activities and courses designed, administered, and conducted by the college's division of community services, thus placing the community services administrator in the somewhat enviable position of having an almost limitless supply of students with needs as diverse as the population itself. Many community services administrators have responded by cranking out more and more courses covering every subject imaginable. In some colleges, program planning consisted of little more than

determining what courses had been successful previously and offering more of the same, or of discovering some segment of the community that had not been "serviced" previously. While there are exceptions to the above generalizations, community services program planning on many campuses consists of little more than offering a number of broad-based, unrelated courses and activities.

The broad-based approach to community services has been highly successful in terms of the number of students served. The Chronicle of Higher Education (1982) stated that, according to statistics released by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) over 21 million adults (one-fourth of whom took courses in two-year colleges) took part in continuing education programs during 1981. Adult education is defined by NCES as "courses and organized educational activities taken part time, whether for credit or noncredit, by adults 17 years of age or over" (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1982). The point is that community services programs can accomplish a great deal by providing organized educational activities, activities clearly in keeping with the educational mission of the community college. There is potential harm in distorting the community services mission by departing too far from the organized educational program and becoming too deeply involved in trying to solve social and economic issues of the community in ways other than through offering organized educational activities which speak to those issues. Indeed, the educational umbrella the community college has chosen for itself (or which has been chosen for it) encompasses any number of activities that can and should be defined as educational. However, considering the increasing numbers of participants in lifelong learning activities and a concomitant need for more structure (and considering that many adults are discovering that Yoga I, II, and II was not all they had in

mind when returning to college), community services administrators need to take a new look at program planning.

Drawing Some Boundaries

Although one should avoid the quicksand of overly precise definitions, one should draw some boundaries around community services activities which would keep them from departing too far from the educational mission of the college. If one accepts the role of the community college as primarily educational, it follows that in order to integrate community services into the college's mission, the thrust of community services must be educational, not social or economic.

The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to a discussion of how community services might be more fully integrated into the college's mission; how a framework of adult learning theory might aid program planning; and, how a unifying theme can help program planning evolve. Chapter Four will discuss the funding situation, and chapter five will focus upon community services leadership.

Community Services Courses: Playing the Numbers Game

An accepted axiom in much of education is that courses come together in some organized structure and result in programs. This axiom has had little meaning in many community services divisions which view courses as their own end. Consequently, little or no effort is expended to assure that one course is related to another, much less to a progam. Community services courses often are offered until they have served their immediate purpose, discarded until needed again, and never become a permanent part of the instructional program. A lack of program planning also results in community services lingering on the periphery of the college's instructional program.

In many instances, the plethora of courses traditionally offered by the community services division has served to introduce large numbers of middle class citizens to the community college. These courses have provided the colleges with excellent public relations, in spite of the criticisms aimed at the least substantial offerings such as belly dancing. Indeed, credit and noncredit courses offered through community services have been an important means for introducing higher education to major segments of the population (the homemaker who enrolls in college after many years of staying at home; the worker who, on his/her own initiative, decides to upgrade his/her skills; the high school dropout; and others). The introduction has used a "soft" approach, requiring little commitment on the part of the individual and almost no penalty for failure.

At a time when much of higher education is facing cutbacks, community services, with its flexibility and responsiveness, may be on the verge of a renaissance. For example, it is estimated that 90 percent of the current labor force will still be working in 1990 and 75 percent will still be working in 2000. In light of the training and retraining needs of industry alone, community services courses should be in great demand; and, the division of community services, with its strong ties to business and industry, would be in a better position than any other segment of the college to provide services. Thus, the "course approach" (both credit and noncredit), which has been used so successfully by community services, should remain an option along with seminars, conferences and other approaches, no matter which direction the community services mission may take. No other approach has the flexibility, the ease of implementation, the low cost, and the general appeal associated with the development of short courses to meet specific needs.

In spite of the many positive attributes of the course approach to community services, certain weaknesses exist. In many instances, the single most important criterion for offering a course has been its popularity. If enough students show up, the course is offered; if not, it is cancelled. In recent years, even large enrollments of students have not justified offering a course; course developers have had to determine if the course could be offered for credit, thus making it eligible for state support. The popularity test, while valid in some instances, is not an adequate way of deciding what courses should be offered.

The popularity approach places the community services administrator in the position of reacting to trends rather than of providing educational leadership. Priorities are not established on sound program planning but on popularity. A course in water usage, determined to be unpopular in terms of numbers enrolled, may be the single most important course a rural community college could offer, yet the decision may be made to offer disco dancing rather than water usage, because of the popularity of disco. While this example is an extreme one, similar decisions are made by community services administrators thousands of times a year; popularity is the overriding theme in deciding what to offer. To simply react is not good enough; leadership must identify new and changing demands.

Community services administrators have, in some instances, been forced to play the numbers game by college presidents, who are interested only in those courses that generate state revenues, and by legislators, who refuse to fund adequately nondegree and special interest courses. Some of the fault belongs with the community services division for its neglect of certain segments of the population. K. Patricia Cross (1981a), among others, has investigated who participates in adult

learning. She uses several definitions of the adult learner, based on the NCES definition (that is, part-time learners participating in organized instruction). Cross reports that the groups seriously underrepresented in organized learning activities are the elderly, Blacks, non-high school graduates, and those with incomes of less than $10,000 (p. 53-54). Cross also points out that the college graduate is more than twice as likely to participate in organized learning activities than the noncollege graduate and that the high school graduate is more than twice as likely to participate as is the nongraduate. The conclusion is obvious: the more education one has, the more one wants and gets (p. 55).

The community services administrator has a special obligation to serve as advocate for the underrepresented groups. Yet, any approach that bases course offerings on popularity will almost guarantee the neglect of these groups. For example, it is unrealistic to expect high school dropouts to become motivated in large enough numbers to "justify" courses to meet their needs. Moreover, these groups want more than a course; they often want programs which have a beginning and an ending and which lead somewhere (even if it is into another program) other than to the next popular course, which may or may not speak to their needs. These groups need more structure than is associated with the course approach to community services.

There are groups other than the ones discussed by Cross who lose in the numbers game. Many colleges, for example, find it difficult to take courses to the people living in the more rural segments of the service region because there are not enough people interested in a single course to justify offering it if enrollment is the only criterion. The result is that rural residents do not have the courses brought to them, they do not make the long trek to the campus, and thus they do not enroll in

college. The community services division has an obligation to serve its rural constitutents, even though the cost may be high.

The decision to serve more fully the underrepresented groups should not be made by the community services division alone; indeed, too many decisions are currently made in isolation by community services leaders. If the underrepresented groups are to be served more fully, the college president and board must be committed to this service and the mission of the college must reflect this commitment. On the other hand, even without a change in mission, the community services administrator can plan programs and activities in a manner that brings them more into the mainstream of the college mission; in order to accomplish this, planning and integration of activities must be given a higher priority than in the past and must enlist the support of the full-time faculty.

Bringing Community Services into the Mainstream

Members of the regular faculty do not always identify with the community college's community services division. The full-time faculty at one college took a dim view of being assigned one or two courses in the community services division. They also had negative feelings toward the possibility of having two-thirds of the college's offerings emanating from the community services area (Green, Shepherd, and Craft, 1978, p. 43). The faculty in two California colleges passed a resolution condemning their district's policy of awarding transfer credit for courses presented over open-circuit television.

The full-time faculty should be involved in community services activities for the following reasons: (1) the shift toward more part-time than full-time students, many of whom are participants in community services programs, means that full-time faculty, if they teach only full-time students, will have fewer contacts

with that portion of the student body which makes up the majority of the college's students; (2) as training and retraining become even more important to the nation's well-being, community colleges, and especially the community services division, will likely be expected to do more in this area than in the past, and it seems ill-advised to exclude full-time faculty from this important undertaking; (3) full-time faculty can often supplement their income by teaching an "overload" in the community services program; and (4) if community services engages in mostly organized educational activities, full-time faculty will better understand the community services mission and will be more likely to support that mission.

Involving the full-time faculty in community services can be done in a number of ways. The simplest and most practical way, it seems, would be to assign community services activities as a part of a regular teaching load. Vaughan (1975) suggested that the gap between community services and the regular instructional program could be bridged by committing 20 percent of each full-time faculty member's teaching load to community services. Looking back, it now appears that the 20 percent commitment to community services was a bit idealistic, although an assignment of some type in community services is desirable. If the assignment is a credit course, it would count toward the fulfillment of the faculty member's regular teaching load; a noncredit course would entitle the faculty member to additional compensation.

Individual faculty members themselves would receive a number of benefits from teaching community services courses. Among them are the following: a greater variety of courses to choose from, enabling the faculty member to teach the more specialized courses which are often not available in the first two years of most programs; course development, providing the full-time

faculty member with a greater opportunity to be innovative than is the case in more traditional programs; exposure to a segment of the student body to which he/she is normally less exposed--and the segment that is becoming more and more the dominant one on campus; the possibility of bringing academic theory to a body of students who are steeped in practice; and, the opportunity to know their communities better by teaching the citizen-student rather than the younger student-citizen.

If the full-time faculty member devotes a percentage of time to teaching community services courses, someone must fill the gap left in the regular instructional program. The "someone" will be, in all probability, the part-time faculty member who is a "community services" faculty member. But here, too, advantages flow to the college by permitting faculty members to move from the community services program to the regular instructional program and vice versa. Some advantages to the part-time faculty member and to the college result from their participating in the regular instructional program. The students are exposed to the banker, the attorney, and others who have practical knowledge, rather than being tied solely to academic theory; consequently, the full-time, often inexperienced, student receives the practical side of the picture along with the theoretical side which is normally presented by the full-time faculty member. As a result, the part-time faculty member gets a different view of the college and its programs, thus becoming a potential advocate for the entire college.

While the above advantages appear desirable, the most important result of the "faculty exchange" is that, through the use of full-time faculty in the community services program, the college brings community services into closer contact with the regular instructional program. Assuming that all organized educational activities are the responsibility of the chief academic officer, the

organizational structure itself promotes a coherence that is missing if the community services and regular instructional programs go in different directions. Organizational coherence is especially important if community services moves into structured program planning.

Advantages of Program Planning and Development

By involving the full-time faculty in community services, a major avenue is opened for program planning. Community services will be evaluated by a faculty member accustomed to teaching courses as a part of programs. Yet, the involvement of full-time faculty alone is not enough to bring community services into the mainstream of the college's educational program.

Community services must retain a number of options for offering instruction. When possible, courses should be related to programs to assure advantages such as the following.

1. The plans of the community services division should be included in the college's long-range curriculum plans, a situation made possible through program planning. Such inclusion will help insure the allocation of faculty, facilities, and dollars to the community services division.

2. Students, and especially older students who have been out of the educational process for a number of years, need to feel that the educational process will complete a phase of their education. The community services student should not have to settle for pot luck. The community services student becomes discouraged if available courses are used up or if no award, other than grade reports, is in sight.[5]

3. Many businesses and industries have provisions for long-range educational opportunities for their employees. A planned training program can eliminate some frustrations of the course-by-course approach. Moreover, most industries have incentive plans that pay for program completion but rarely for course completion.

4. By planning programs, community services provides students with the opportunity to plan their careers based on a career ladder concept, thus relating past and present educational activities to future plans. In addition to permitting one program to build on another, the ladder concept permits the college and the student to avoid costly duplication in course offerings and duplications within sequential courses. Community services and industry must not make the same costly mistakes that the nursing profession has made in many states in failing, until recently, to build the career ladder concept into program planning.

5. By packaging courses into meaningful programs, community services administrators can alleviate some of the criticisms that result from offering unrelated courses. For example, if a course in skiing is presented as the physical education component of a two-year degree program, it is less likely to be offered as a purely recreational course. The public often views courses that are uncoordinated in relationship to each other and to the college curriculum as a questionable use of college resources; courses grouped into programs that lead to employee upgrading are viewed more positively.

Community Services and the Adult Learner

Community services leaders have not ignored the adult learner. Classes are scheduled at convenient times and locations (for example, three-hour blocks to permit the working adult to utilize time more effectively); some progress has been made toward awarding credit based on experience. Nevertheless, much remains to be done in planning programs for the adult learner. The majority of community services planners have inadequately dealt with the following questions: In what ways are adults treated differently from younger students? What are the implications for faculty members who have taught younger students and who now teach older ones? Should

full-time faculty members have special training to teach in the community services program where they are more likely to encounter older students? What can be done to introduce the faculty to adult learning theory? Should adult transitions be considered in building a program? Why do the majority of adults fail to participate in organized educational activities? How can the community services administrator translate theory into practice? The list seems endless, but the point is that most classes are taught by faculty members in basically the same way, regardless of the age or life experiences of their students. It seem inconceivable that community services has not built more of its activities around what we know about the adult learner.

Community services administrators need to realize that adults have special needs that go beyond scheduling classes in the evening or at a local business. Moreover, when the community services administrator brings adult learning theory to bear on program planning, it is highly likely that the college's counseling services will be brought into the planning process, thus moving community services even closer to the mainstream of college activities.

Two recent works should be considered by community services administrators who wish to bring adult learning theory to bear on program planning. K. Patricia Cross's Adults as Learners. Increasing Participation and Facilitating Learning (1981a) is an excellent summary of the current research on adult learning. It serves as a guide for further reading and provides practical suggestions for educating adults. The book is also valuable because of Cross's close association with and understanding of the community college. Another work that should be read by community service administrators is Americans in Transition: Life Changes as Reasons for Adult Learning by Carol Aslanian and

Henry M. Brickell (1980) who, like Cross, give practical advice that may be helpful in planning adult programs. Also, like Cross, the authors are familiar with the community college's mission.[6]

Developing a Coherent Theme

Through program development, community services can bring a greater degree of coherence to its offerings. However, program development alone will not suffice to place community services in a leadership position. What community services needs is a unifying theme to define more clearly its own purpose and that of the college.

If developing a unifying theme that community services can rally around is a valid idea, what should it incorporate? Certainly community services must continue to work with part-time adult students; it must continue to work with business and industry. The theme should be supported by the college at large, should have the potential for bringing about change, and should be a theme that will improve the quality of life for our nation.

We are suggesting that community services should rally around the age-old concept of citizenship education. Simply stated, the purpose of citizenship education is to provide individuals with the tools to function effectively in today's society, a purpose in keeping with the community college's total mission.

The teaching of citizenship education in the two-year college emerged early in the college's history. Indeed, over 50 years ago, two of the patriarchs of the junior college movement viewed the teaching of citizenship as a major reason for the college's existence (Eells, 1931, p. 195; Koos, 1925, pp. 19-28). Another early junior college advocate, Alexis Lange, stated in 1915 that the providing of "civic education" should be a part of the junior college's mission (Eells, 1931, pp. 195-196).

A more recent statement by Robert J. Havighurst (1971) emphasizes the role of the community college in

promoting the citizenship function. He believes, and we agree, that the community college must go beyond teaching people about their government.[7] He states that "the citizenship function would not be interpreted in purely rational terms as the imparting of knowledge on civic affairs. It also includes a large, nonintellective aspect of building toward social cohesion by enlisting young people and mature adults in the exchange of ideas and experiences relative to the problems of living in the modern community" (Havighurst, 1971, p. 157). Advocating an approach promoted by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges during the past several years, Havighurst suggests that all segments of society come together in community forums to examine community issues and to propose solutions to problems, thus fostering communications between various ethnic, religious, and socioeconomic groups (1971, p. 157).

The call for civic education received a new impetus from a 1981 Carnegie Foundation essay by Ernest Boyer and Fred Hechinger. These authors assert that "as a nation, we are becoming civically illiterate. Unless we find better ways to educate ourselves as citizens, we run the risk of drifting unwittingly into a new kind of Dark Age--a time when small cadres of specialists will control knowledge and thus control the decision-making process" (1981, p. 47). Commenting that citizenship education is a lifelong process, Boyer and Hechinger note that higher education is falling short in meeting the civic needs of its students. "While older students are going back to school, the sad fact is that, on many campuses, lifelong learning remains a program without purpose. Adult Education courses grow like Topsy--but goals are not well defined" (p. 49). "We propose that the nation's colleges and universities become systematically engaged in the civic education of adults" (p. 50)

It would appear that community colleges have a golden opportunity to take a leadership role in providing education for citizenship, and no segment of the college's operation is in a better position to fulfill the leadership role on campus than is the community services division. What has been missing, and what is needed, is a unifying theme of citizenship education that will give coherence to the many activities that community services has done with such vigor, and in many cases, has done well.

Conclusion

This chapter has argued that community services can and should move into the mainstream of community college activities. This movement can be accomplished by devoting more time to program development, by integrating full-time faculty into community services activities, and by identifying and developing a central theme around which community services and the college can rally. However, without financial resources and enlightened leadership, the arguments of this chapter have little meaning.

Chapter 4
FUNDING COMMUNITY SERVICES: AN EXPRESSION OF COMMITMENT?

Ask any community college administrator to list the major problems facing community colleges today, and funding will undoubtedly appear at or very near the top of the list. Recent surveys provide ample verification. Johnson (1979) reported that financial support ranked behind only collective bargaining as the most critical problem in the nearly fifty colleges he visited in 1977-1978. Gilder (1980) reported the results of an informal survey of 400 community college presidents conducted by Gleazer in which financing was first among a list of leading issues confronting those presidents in the immediate future. And in a national survey of state directors of community colleges conducted in the fall of 1980, and again in a limited follow-up in 1981, Wattenbarger and Bibby (1981) reported a host of financial problems in the responding states. In fact, of those states reporting, only Texas and New Mexico indicated no financing problems at that time.

A cursory review of the titles of a few recent books and monographs in higher education reinforces the centrality of this issue to all of higher education.[8] Community services practitioners are especially concerned about the state of funding. Atwell and Sullins (1977) referred to financing as a "major dilemma." Ireland (1982), Kintzer (1980), and Jackson (1981) have chronicled the impact of the Jarvis-Gann amendment (popularly known as Proposition 13) in California and similar amendments in other states. Based on the studies of six California community colleges conducted in the summer of 1978, Jackson concluded that Proposition 13 did not bring about fundamental changes either in the colleges or in their program and activities except in a

shift of classes from evening and weekends to weekdays and in "the near elimination of extensive community-service programs, where they existed" (Jackson, 1981, p. 150).

Ireland's 1982 work, more recent and more comprehensive than Jackson's, simply adds support and depth to earlier reports. A partial bail-out from state surpluses in the year immediately following the Jarvis-Gann amendment and the use of college reserves softened the expected impact of the tax-cutting legislation in fiscal year 1979. In fiscal year 1980, however, community services revenue in California community colleges declined by 16 percent. Perhaps of equal importance, the primary source of revenue shifted to local general fund support with fees constituting nearly a third of the revenue base, an increase of 71 percent over the preceding year.

As might be expected, the axe fell unevenly on types of community services programs. Enrollments in the instruction component of the community services program suffered only a 3 percent decline but fees increased 80 percent. Recreational, cultural, and community development programs experienced major enrollment declines, accounting for 75 percent of the total drop in the number of participants statewide (Ireland, 1982).

No claim is made here that the California experience is typical or even representative of communtiy services programs nationwide. These figures do serve, however, to underline the contention that the issue of adequate funding is one of major concern not only to presidents, chancellors, and deans, but also to those who labor in the vineyard of community services.

Research and systematic surveys aside, William Keim, a long-time community services practitioner, pinpointed the issue: "The name of today's game is finance"

(Keim, 1976, p. 8). Adequate funding is the sine qua non of an effective, comprehensive program of community services, and the lack of such funding in some states and at some institutions has resulted in a serious decline in community services programming.

The purpose of this chapter is to review ways in which community services programs are funded across the country, to examine how these funding patterns affect programming in some states, and, to raise several questions central to funding.

Funding Sources

Funding sources for community services arise from the same limited sources as the rest of higher education: federal, state, and local tax support; fees; and gifts or grants from individuals, businesses, and foundations. To a greater or lesser extent, community services programs have benefited from all of these funding sources. Space limitations prohibit detailed analysis of all possible sources of revenue. In keeping with the amount of income emanating from each source, this discussion will center principally upon tax revenue from the state and local levels and upon revenues from user fees.

The lack of attention here to revenue from the federal government and from gifts and grants should not be construed as diminishing the importance of these sources. Funds from Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended) were available for community services programs until the expiration of that portion of the Act in 1980 (Harrington, 1977, pp. 141-144). In fiscal year 1978, for example, 174 public four-year colleges (26 percent of all institutions receiving awards) received funding under Title I-A (National Advisory Council, 1979, p. 136). Other colleges have used CETA (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act) and other federal funds to support community services activities.

While not a major funding source nationally, private foundations and community organizations have contributed to some colleges. Accurate reporting on the volume and utilization of these types of funds would require a college-by-college canvass. Gollattscheck, Harlacher, Roberts, and Wygal (1976, pp. 74-78) state the case for seeking these funds in a clear and succinct manner, although they do not provide evidence of the level of funding from these sources.

Even though funds from these sources may be available, they usually are limited, often restricted, short-term, and sometimes require matching funds from the college. For most institutions, funds from these sources are viewed as supplemental, not the basis upon which a comprehensive program of community services is built.

State Aid

Just as community colleges have changed over the years, so has the role of the state in financing community college programs. The early, junior colleges, mostly extensions of secondary schools, were supported mainly from local funds. Partly due to concerns about equity[9], but also reflecting the growing recognition of community colleges as a vital link in a total system of education, the states gradually assumed an increasing responsibility for funding. Wattenbarger and Bibby (1981) reported that the state share of community college operating income in 1980 was 66 percent compared to 51 percent only 12 years before.

Even more recent data released by the Education Commission of the States (ECS) reveal that, of the 49 states that have public two-year colleges, 34 (over two-thirds) provided half or more of the operating revenue for community colleges. The median percent of operating funds provided by all 49 states is 63 percent with state support ranging from just under 20 percent in

Wisconsin (excluding the university center system) to over 90 percent in Delaware (92 percent), Massachusetts (100 percent), and in Washington (97 percent)[10] (Dougherty and others, 1982).

Just as the state portion of the revenues has increased, local contributions have decreased. Wattenbarger and Bibby (1981) reported a median local share of only 7 percent in 1980. The 1981 data reported by ECS identify 21 states in which no local effort is required (even permitted, in many cases), only one state (Arizona) in which half or more of the funds came from local sources, and only 12 states which contribute over one-fourth of the operating costs of their two-year colleges.

The trend is clear. The states have assumed an ever-increasing role in providing operating funds for community colleges. Is it any wonder, then, that community services administrators have looked toward their state capitols with eager eyes and outstretched hands? If, indeed, community services are a vital and central component of the total program of a comprehensive community college, why shouldn't local administrators expect state policymakers to include community services in state funding formulas? A review of current patterns of state funding for community services may be enlightening, if not comforting.

In preparation for this analysis, the authors began with the recent finance survey conducted by ECS (Dougherty and others, 1982). The ECS data includes information on whether or not funding formulas were used, whether community services were included in the formulas, and whether any special constraints or restrictions were imposed on the use of state funds. With these data as a starting point, the authors then contacted community college educators, either state office personnel or community services practitioners, in more

than thirty-five states in order to verify, clarify, and expand upon the data gathered by ECS. Basing their impressions upon the ECS report and upon the discussions with state office personnel and community services practitioners, they concluded that there is no one single method of allocating state funds to community colleges. In fact, after months of intensive investigation, Breneman and Nelson concluded that "no 'best' plan exists for the financing of community colleges and thus (we) do not propose one" (1981, p. 161).

For the purposes of this analysis, we broadly group states into two reasonable and convenient categories: formula-funded states and nonformula-funded states.[11] The clustering of cost-based and minimum foundation funding into one category with unit rate and other formulas oversimplifies funding practices and may offend the student of higher education finance. However, these categories are adequate to demonstrate how community services programs fare in states where community services appear in the formula and in states where budgets are negotiated or based upon some other, more arbitrary method.

Formula-Funded States. According to the ECS data (Dougherty and others, 1982), 30 states fund community colleges on some type of formula basis; that is, the state makes available a set amount for some unit of work such as credit hours, FTE (full-time equivalent) enrollment, or FTE faculty unit. In cost-based variations of this method, state payment varies with the actual costs of instruction, normally set after extensive cost studies. Minimum foundation funding involves variations in state contributions based upon the ability of local districts to pay. In other words, less wealthy districts receive additional state funds to offset lower tax revenue in an effort to equalize educational opportunity across the state.

Frequent adjustments are made aside from the approved formulas, such as variations for very small institutions because of the inherent ineffeciencies associated with their size. Of the 30 formula states, 22 states utilize a unit rate formula, 7 employ some type of cost-based method, and 1 uses a minimum foundation approach.

Only 7 states[12] of these 30 states reported to ECS that community services was included in their funding formula along with items such as instruction, research, student services, and general administration. (Interestingly enough, even research, rarely considered a principal function of the community college, is included in 11 state formulas.) The absence of community services from funding formulas in over three-fourths of the formula states is disturbing, but not altogether surprising. Even more disturbing is the fact that in 4 of the 7 states which recognize community services in their formula, major restrictions exist. For example, Arkansas specifically excludes noncredit instruction from state support and funds only the administrative overhead costs of community services programming. In Tennessee, governing board policy clearly mandates that continuing education units (CEU) and noncredit activities be self-supporting. The state provides funds ($50,000 annually for community colleges and technical institutes with enrollments of 2,500 or less, and $75,000 for larger institutions) only for the administration of public service and continuing education programs. In fact, as in many other states, colleges in Tennessee are expected to collect a surcharge (25 percent) from students in order to defray all costs (aside from the aforementioned administrative grant) associated with these activities.

Similarly, Kansas and Louisiana explicitly exclude noncredit (Kansas) and contining education (Louisiana) courses from state funding. Iowa,[13] which does fund

certain community services programming on a contact hour basis, excludes recreational and avocational activities as well as programs for nonresidents. In Pennsylvania the picture is somewhat brighter. Pennsylvania, although calculating community services activities as laboratory hours for FTE purposes, funds community services enrollments at the same rate as other programs, currently about $600 in state monies per FTE student. Criteria for eligibility for funding are liberal as long as the proposed activity has an educational objective.

Community services funding in North Carolina provides a ray of optimism for those who look to the states to fund the college mission. North Carolina's funding package is both comprehensive and generous. First of all, over three-fourths (77.6 percent) of the operating budgets of that state's 57 public two-year colleges comes from state sources. Local funds (12.2 percent) are required only for plant operation; meanwhile, tuition rates remain among the lowest in the country with a cost of $3.25 per quarter hour, with a maximum cost of $39 per quarter.

North Carolina's funding formula provides support for both credit and noncredit extension or continuing education activities. Currently this funding is at a rate slightly less than half of that for regular curriculum programs. Support is available in categories entitled occupational extension, academic extension, avocational, and a newly proposed category called practical skills. Only recreational activities are excluded from funding. Students are charged a modest fee ($15 per course in the avocational and proposed practical skills areas and $8 in other areas) which reverts to the state.

In addition to this state support, colleges may use local tax funds or support from local business and industry, for example, to fund additional activities,

which then become part of the base upon which funding for the succeeding year is based.

Needless to say, community services activities in North Carolina are flourishing. North Carolina leads the nation in community services enrollments with nearly a million citizens enrolled, more than 12 percent of all community education enrollments in community colleges (Yarrington, 1982, p. 76). Even more impressive is the ratio of community education enrollments to credit enrollments. Nationally, this ratio is slightly less than one-to-one (.86/1.0). In North Carolina community education enrollments are 4½ times credit enrollments. Only Wisconsin approaches such a ratio. This is ample testimony of the impact of adequate funding upon participation in community services activities.

Even though these seven states reported to ECS that they utilized a funding formula to finance community college programs and that community services activities were included in these formulas, closer analysis revealed that at least two states (Arkansas and Tennessee) funded only administrative overhead and at least two others (Louisiana and Kansas) funded only credit activities. Only North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Iowa have what might be labeled comprehensive funding policies. This analysis serves to highlight the definitional problem which has haunted community services since its inception (Cohen and Brawer, 1982; Gollattscheck and others, 1976; Harlacher, 1969; Karvelis, 1978; Myran, 1969).

Now for the good news! The ambiguities surrounding the definition of community services works both ways; it also serves to mask a few fairly liberal funding practices in states which indicated to ECS that community services activities were not included in funding formulas. Twenty-three[14] of the 30 formula-funded states indicated to ECS that community services activities were <u>not</u> included in state funding formulas. In over half of

these 23 states, noncredit or community services activities are specifically excluded from state support. However, follow-up contacts with most of these states resulted in the identification of at least six states that do provide at least some recognition in their funding formulas for community services.

In Illinois, for example, several classes of instruction are financed from state funds. However, all noncredit activities are expected to be self-supporting. In Michigan, the state has adopted a taxonomy of courses that are eligible to receive state aid. A classification called "Hobby, Craft, and Recreation" is typically not funded but activities or courses within the approved taxonomy are funded at a level equivalent to regular credit activities. As one might imagine, most community services activities in Michigan are credit-bearing, some awarding as little as one-fourth of a credit hour.

In New York's SUNY community colleges, state funding is provided for community services courses classified as "vocational, remedial, and community services" but a category labeled "pleasure group" activities is not eligible for state funds. Similarly, South Carolina funds a noncredit category called "Continuing Education" which includes apprenticeship programs, adult basic education/graduate equivalent diploma (ABE/GED) training and supervisory development training but which excludes avocational and seminar/workshop activities.

Perhaps the most liberal state in the group is Maryland. Maryland has identified several classifications of noncredit courses that are eligible for state funding at the same level as credit activities. These include courses of a vocational nature, those related to health and safety, industrial training, courses leading to licensure or certification, developmental courses, and community development activities. Avocational courses are not eligible for state aid.

Wisconsin presents perhaps the most atypical funding pattern of these states. State funding is not awarded for community services activities; however, colleges are permitted to count community services enrollments (based on a conversion of contact hours to FTEs) in calculating their operating costs per FTE. In effect, this reduces the per-student expenditures and results in placing the individual college in a more favorable position for additional state aid in succeeding years. (Wisconsin currently has a ceiling on annual budget increments of 9.5 percent).

In most of the other formula states, funding for the direct costs of community services activities is available only for certain categories of courses, such as developmental, occupational, remedial, GED and ABE courses (in New Jersey), and certain types of vocational courses (in Missouri and Oregon).

Florida presents a slightly different picture. Community colleges in Florida are funded on a cost-based formula which takes into account institutional size (two categories) and program costs (31 specific disciplines in three major program categories defined as advanced and professional, occupational, and developmental). Despite this comprehensive approach, community services programs are not included in the formula. Instead, the Florida legislature appropriates a special fund outside the formula to support community services activities in a number of community problem areas. These categories include the environment, health, safety, human relations, consumer education, government, and education and child rearing.

Community instruction services (CIS) were funded at something over $4.8 million for the 1981-82 fiscal year, a reduction of 25 percent from the preceding year. The CIS fund is appropriated annually, varies annually, and is based upon the population of the college's service

area rather than upon enrollments, contact hours, CEUs, or some other such productivity measure.

Monies from Florida's CIS fund are intended principally to offset the direct costs of instruction, although they may be used for such items as clerical support, advertising, or printing. These funds permit Florida colleges to keep students' fees to a minimum while remaining one of the nation's leaders in community services enrollments.[15]

The allocation of CIS funds is to a region or a service area, not necessarily to the area community college as the funding agent. The regions include not only the community college but each of the public school districts located in the college's service area. A regional coordinating council is formed to represent all of the educational agencies. This council formulates the spending plan and, in effect, allocates CIS monies to the various agencies to conduct community service activities.

Despite the failure to provide specifically for the direct costs of community services, most of the remaining formula states consider community services to be an integral part of the community college mission and expect state funds to be used for the administration of community services programs as well as for other support services such as clerical assistance, maintenance, and utilities.

Moreover, in those states where there are no statutory or regulatory restrictions to the use of state funds, state monies are often diverted to community services programming. In Arizona, for example, where governing board policy expressly mandates that colleges "provide cultural and community service programs" (Arizona, 1982, p. 2), the prevailing philosophy is one of self-support of these activities through course fees and other user fees. A recent Arizona study revealed that one of the four institutions studied routinely transferred, by

local board policy, state monies from the general fund to supplement fee income from community services programs (Arizona, 1982).

Perhaps the state least supportive of community services is Massachusetts. Not only is community services excluded in the state-funding formula, but community services is required to recover from fees all direct and indirect costs of providing service. Administrative and clerical salaries, advertising and printing, maintenance, utilities, even rent on space utilized, is the responsibility of the fee-based community services budget. In effect, community service , as well as regular credit courses in the evening, functions as a private enterprise within the public sector. The community services administrator is placed in a position similar to that of a private contractor who buys space and other goods from the college and sells services to the public, preferably at a markup sufficient to cover all costs.

Nonformula States. Of the 49 states with public community colleges, 19 states use some method of allocating state funds other than a formula. By far, the predominant technique in the nonformula states is the so-called negotiated budget. Just as the name implies, budgets in these states[16] are negotiated with the state governing board or legislative body without reference to a formula or a similar set of guidelines.

Although 16 states still rely on a negotiated budget for community college funding, many of these states have relatively low enrollment and few colleges (five states have five or fewer colleges, and none has as many as 20 colleges). The 16-state total accounts for only six percent of both credit and community education enrollments in all public two-year colleges. Moreover, several of the states have unique organizational or governing arrangements. For example, 13 of Indiana's 14 two-year colleges are campuses of Indiana Vocational Technical

College. Most of Georgia's colleges are part of the University of Georgia system. All of Alaska'a 11 public colleges are part of the University of Alaska, and all except four of West Virginia's 10 two-year colleges are either branches or components of four-year colleges or universities.

Whether because of the budget process or the uniqueness of the states' community college programs (low enrollments, small number of colleges, organizational pattern, etc.) community services programs are less likely to receive substantial state funding from non-formula states. Most of the 16 states permit the use of state funds for the employment of a community services or contining education administrator, but, with few exceptions, no state support is available for the direct costs of community services programs. At least seven states (Alaska, Delaware, Georgia, Montana, Nebraska, Utah, and West Virginia) specifically exclude community services or noncredit courses from state funding. Community services administrators in these 16 states rely almost entirely upon fees for the support of non-credit activities.

Kentucky, which utilizes a combination of an incremental budget and negotiated budget, requires that all the direct costs of community services programs be self-supporting. Only the salaries of the community services coordinator and clerical assistants come from state funds, with a trend toward expecting fee support to absorb at least some of these salaries as well as the direct costs of instruction. Nevada's budget is legislatively determined and, according to the ECS report, excludes community services courses from state funding.

California, long a leading state in community services offerings, utilizes an incremental budget process with the base-year budget adjusted at a marginal rate for changes in any activity. Until the passage of

Proposition 13, California colleges relied heavily upon a local special purpose tax (5 cents per $100 assessed valuation) for the funding of community services activities. This revenue source is no longer available to the community colleges. This loss and the absence of funding for the direct costs of community services activities has placed the revenue burden upon fees and local and general fund support. Pressures abound for fees to increase to the point where the administrative overhead costs are also recovered from fees. While such a funding pattern is not uncommon, the loss of the special tax revenue has resulted in significant changes in the delivery of community services in California (Ireland, 1982).

Local Support

For the purpose of this discussion and analysis, both local tax monies and user fees are considered to be local funds. Earlier in this chapter reference was made to the trend toward increased state funding of community colleges and the concomitant reduction in reliance upon local tax support for operating monies. In over 40 percent of the states, no local tax effort is required. In some of these states, localities are not even permitted to provide operating expenses. In others, local boards are advisory in nature rather than governing, and are fiscally dependent, i.e., they have no taxing authority of their own. Even in states with substantial local funding, the competition within the college for the educational dollar frequently results in the community services program being funded, if at all, as a peripheral activity.

After reviewing state-funding practices and the trends outlined above, the inescapable conclusion is that, with a few notable exceptions, community services activities are expected to be self-supporting. Except for the handful of states where dollars accompany the expectation that colleges provide these services, colleges are

finding themselves on their own to fund the direct costs of noncredit instruction. Moreover, it is becoming increasingly common to find not only direct[17] costs recovered through fees but also a major portion of the indirect costs as well. Colleges in many states have established surcharges or cost overrides of up to 50 percent in order to recover some, if not all, of the indirect costs of providing community services activities. In most states this revenue remains at the college earmarked for community services. But in other states, particularly those with no local tax funding, the overcharge is returned to the state's general revenue fund for community colleges.

Although not yet a clear pattern of operation, the Massachusetts approach where community services programs have to generate not only all direct costs associated with the program but all indirect costs as well, may be a harbinger of things to come. In at least a few states pressures are being brought to bear to require fee revenue sufficient to recover at least some of the administrative overhead associated with the programs.

Reference has been made previously to the recently published report on community college financing by the Brookings Institution. As a result of their national study, Breneman and Nelson (1981, p. 206) stated, "There is no strong economic case for state support of most noncredit courses. Analysis of courses in this category suggests that financing should be provided either through user fees or payments by local government or private agencies." It appears that current practice--and, certainly, present trends--suggests that the Breneman and Nelson proposal is well on the way to acceptance in most states.

Summary

With the exception of institutions in a half-dozen or so states, most of which utilize a unit rate or cost-based

funding formula, community colleges can count on little more than support for some or all of the overhead costs of community services programs from state funds. Nothing in the discussions with state officials points to a liberalizing of these funding practices. In fact, the trend is toward expecting the local level of government to absorb more and more of the costs of community services programs. With the gradual but definite assumption of the responsibility for funding operating costs of community colleges by the states, local support for community services has come to mean user fees. Yet these fees are set at a rate high enough to return not only the direct costs of instruction but also frequently to include an override or surcharge of up to 50 percent in order to defray part of all of the indirect costs. The prospects of support from federal sources seem dim and, although a major source of support in a few institutions, substantial funding assistance from the private sector is not a factor in most programs.

The picture painted here is not substantially different from that revealed in a study by Evans (1973) nearly a decade ago, or by Roed in 1977 (Cohen and Brawer, 1982, p. 269). Projections by Yarrington (1976) and Lombardi (1978a) are no more optimistic about additional state funds, and Brenoman and Nelson (1981) are clear in their recommendation that most community services activities should be financed through user charges (p. 207).

What are the implications of these findings? Should community colleges retreat from the comprehensive mission? Some have, except for credit activities. Discussions with state and college officials revealed several who apparently have decided that the price was too high and have relinquished the community services mission to other community agencies or have abandoned it completely.

Should community services administrators adopt the entrepreneurial model which has been forced upon managers in Massachusetts? Should community services activities be restricted only to those who can afford cost-plus fees? Or maybe colleges should work surreptitiously to relabel activities (Belly Dancing becomes Middle Eastern Interpretive Movement) so they will be more acceptable (at least temporarily). Perhaps activities which historically have been, and should be, non-credit will be converted into credit courses for funding purposes.

None of these alternative responses is new or novel. All have been chosen as the response to a funding crisis by community colleges somewhere.

Rather than engage in the type of knee-jerk reactions and survival behaviors which are typified above, college leaders should focus upon the causes of the problem, not the symptoms. In a 1982 essay, published shortly after his death, Stephen K. Bailey said: "Adequate funding is in my estimation a derivative issue. If the public believes that our purposes are important and our standards high, they will fund us with at least some measure of adequacy" (1982, p. 28). Bailey's comments were addressed to the financial support of higher education in general, but his point applies at least as well to the funding of community services. If, indeed, he is correct--and these authors are convinced that he is--then community services advocates might do well to approach the funding problem by helping decision makers to understand the appropriate role of community services in the overall mission of the college. With the inexorable shifts in overall funding and coordination--if not control--from the local district to the state, the sphere of influence of proponents of community services must transcend the community and extend to the state capital and beyond.

Community services leaders must answer for themselves, and then seek consensus on those answers, such questions as: In the event of continued funding at existing levels, should community services simply continue current practices or should the nature of programs be altered considerably? Upon what grounds, if any, can the case for additional tax funds for community services be built? How should these additional funds be utilized? If state funds become more scarce, how can colleges tap local sources for adequate funding, especially in districts where local tax effort is not required?

These are not simple questions; nor will the answers be easily determined. Even though danger in proposing solutions to such complex problems looms, several suggestions are offered in Chapter 6. The following chapter is devoted to the role of leadership in solving the problems identified here and in earlier chapters.

Chapter 5
LEADERSHIP: REQUISITE FOR SUCCESS

Reexamination of the community services function to achieve consensus about and to gain widespread commitment to the restated function requires a heightened level of leadership from community services advocates. Cross (1981b), Martorana and Smutz (1982), Breneman and Nelson (1981) among others have documented that the necessary consensus and commitment are not present today. Yet, nationally recognized community college leaders such as Gleazer (1980), Gollattscheck, Harlacher, Roberts, and Wygal (1976) have advocated a prominent role for community services within the mission of the community colleges. Such leaders have proposed a prominent role, but the commitment is lacking both within and outside of the colleges. What leadership is yet needed? Can any greater successes be expected?

Various factors have mitigated the exercise of effective leadership in colleges, especially in areas applicable to the community services activity. Numerous authors have written about the recent pressures that have forced college administrators to devote less time to leadership activities. Stoke (1959) and Dodds (1962) identified the impact of burgeoning enrollments with the attendant expansions of programs, staffs, facilities, and budgets that compelled presidents to concentrate on management of services rather than on leadership. Bennis (1973) wrote of growing public pressures to concentrate on management detail rather than on more inportant issues of purposes and goals. Gleazer (1980) addressed the need for greater balance between management and leadership, but cautioned that more leadership, not less management, was needed. There is agreement that essential management activities have crowded out equally essential, but less urgent, leadership activities.

Increasing pressures for concentration on management detail have come at a time when the practice of leadership of the magnitude now needed was not witnessed during the heyday of community colleges, a period when virtually every facet of American society, including the economy, was expanding. Community college presidents and community services administrators were not called upon to convince policymakers that certain programs were appropriate or merited public support; virtually everything was acceptable. The current debate over community college purposes and community services functions arises from, or at least is exacerbated by, a downturn in economic growth that has forced legislators, county commissioners, and other policymakers to choose between programs and activities that were previously unchallenged.

Not since philanthropist Ezra Cornell and Andrea White (the founder and first president of Cornell University) took on the awesome task of introducing courses such as engineering, agriculture, music, and modern language to the college curriculum has the need for substantive leadership in any segment of higher education arisen. The fulfillment of Cornell's dream to "found an institution where any person can find instruction in any study" (Pullias, 1975, p. 47) required the land-grant advocates to convince the traditionalists of their day that such courses were appropriate to higher education. They exerted their leadership efforts on those who staffed as well as on those who controlled the new institution.

Community services leaders face a similar challenge as they look toward gaining consensus and commitment among community college faculty and administrators as well as community, state, and national policymakers. They will perforce be required to exercise leadership with those who govern the institutions as they strive to

influence the decisions and policies that affect community services and leadership with those who work to implement the college's purposes.

Renewing the Leaders

The authors believe that most persons filling critical roles, such as those of president and community services director, possess the potential for leadership, but have not exercised their leadership skills to the extent now required. Simply devoting more time to leadership activities may not suffice. Leadership renewal will require thought, planning, preparation, and practice. Leaders must give careful consideration to just what they want to accomplish through their efforts to influence others in the governance and management of the college, and then they must plan strategies for accomplishing the goals they have devised. They will need to prepare themselves for the task by becoming thoroughly informed and enthusiastically committed to the community services function. Last, but equally important, they will need to practice their leadership, to replace such tasks as controlling and directing with influencing, persuading, and encouraging.

Myran has stated that the community services director must take the lead in community services because "his milieu is not that of other college administrators, his path is not clear, and his success is not assured" (1969, p. 34). Myran's views remain valid today, and no community college will have a vigorous community services program without a strong leader at the helm and a chief executive of the college who places a high priority on community services within the context of the total college mission. Together, the president and community services director, along with other key persons who may be involved in leadership roles, will need to come to agreement among themselves about the goals they will seek to attain. Consensus among faculty and the

community will be unattainable unless those who fill the leadership roles receive clear signals. Those leaders should assist each other in becoming informed by sharing and discussing readings and by becoming professionally involved in the community services field. Active participation in the National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education, the Community Education Association, the Adult Education Association, or other professional organizations that relate to the community services mission is a valuable means of leadership development, from becoming better informed to building and practicing leadership skills. The NCCSCE is noteworthy in its efforts to afford leadership opportunities to presidents, deans, directors, and others keenly interested in community services and to recognize outstanding leadership in the colleges on a regular basis.

Myran identified five key factors that contribute to effective leadership of community services programs: knowledge of the community; high standards for courses and activities; willingness to take risks and make changes; curriculum planning and development; and aggressive seeking of funds (1969, p. 36). Of the five, the first four are especially pertinent to the leadership required today. The fifth, seeking of funds, seems to follow efforts to gain consensus and commitment where true leasdership will be required. However, the requirement of knowing the community clearly fits the need to become thoroughly informed about community services and its potential and to develop a clear sense of direction that leads to a plan to serve unmet educational needs within the priorities of the community. Community services leaders have been and will need to be innovative, even risk-taking, as they discover myriad needs that require nontraditional solutions. While the community services programs will make use of many modes of delivery in addition to credit courses, including noncredit

courses, workshops, consultations, and sequences of experiences, high standards of quality must be maintained throughout the services if they are to build and retain widespread acceptability and support. Community services leaders who dedicate their efforts to determining what is to be accomplished and planning appropriate strategies toward those ends can build the needed grassroots level support.

While considerable variations in needs and attendant programs and services will exist from college to college, at least a modicum of consensus about what comprises community services must be achieved among community services leaders, at least within, if not between, the states. Coherent and consistent statements, must come from the community services leaders who seek support from boards, community officials, legislators, state governing or coordinating councils and boards, and other policymakers.

Leadership Within the College

Most community services directors were probably not surprised by reports by Cross (1981b) and others that there is little commitment to community services among college faculty and staff members. In many colleges, community services programs have been developed by skirting around indifferent to antagonistic faculty members and other administrators, and, as long as one did not bother the other (one did not consume the others's resources), all has worked fine. The era of limited resources has increased the level of competition within the college; as a result, the need for resolving growing conflict has increased. More importantly, as a precursor to gaining widespread consensus and commitment in the community and the state capitals, acceptance within the college is essential.

Efforts to produce greater faculty and staff support for community services must be part of a long-range and

continued plan of action that includes a variety of complementary activities. Faculty and staff members may view short-term or infrequent efforts to gain support for specific programs or plans as self-serving and insincere; this may result in hardened resistance. Gaining consensus and commitment can be enhanced by involving faculty and staff in substantive discussions and decision-making processes regarding community services. A college committee or task force composed of faculty members, administrators, and others (such as students and citizens) can contribute to the process by providing a ready forum for discussions, testing program ideas, and developing a clear sense of involvement. The role, responsibility, and authority of the committee should be clear, and members should be aware, through evidence of the disposition of recommendations and suggestions that are proposed, that they serve a substantive role. The planned information program for committee members should include opportunities for travel to conferences as well as exposure to the literature in the field. For example, committee members might be asked to attend the annual meeting of NCCSCE, all members might receive copies of the Council's publication Community Services Catalyst and other periodicals or books pertinent to the field, and members might be asked to visit other campuses to view exemplary programs. Closer to home, committee members whould receive detailed reports on community services programs and activities and have the opportunity to observe various programs and to meet community services participants.

The committee, to be effective, should be composed of interested faculty and staff members who are appointed for terms exceeding one year, since the educational process will require considerable time. As members become more thoroughly informed about community services in general as well as about the programs offered by the

CS

college and as they work with the community services director over a period of time, they will be prepared to be fully involved in substantive discussions and decisions that are likely to lead to consensus about the nature and scope of community services at their college. Involving faculty members in a formal way, such as membership on the college committee, will facilitate the articulation between community services programs and the rest of the curriculum and between part-time and full-time faculty. Also aided by such involvement would be decisions regarding community services courses that relate to the regular curriculum (such as grading standards, whether to offer credit, use of laboratories versus lectures, and qualifications of faculty). Drawing in the participation of faculty and staff on substantive discussions and decisions will engender trust and yield far more favorable support than might otherwise be expected.

In addition to working with faculty and staff, who may occupy a formal role that builds a close working relationship with the community services program, the director should establish a variety of programs that are intended to produce a well-informed faculty and staff in general. Regular reports and newsletters that are brief and informative, copies of pertinent articles from the Community Services Catalyst and other journals, and other appropriate materials should be circulated among all faculty and staff. Informal meetings with individuals and groups to discuss proposals and programs with the director or members of the college committee, presentations at faculty meetings, and other means should be employed to get important information to faculty and staff members. Maximum feasible use of regular faculty and staff in the various courses, programs, and activities will help them become more intimately informed about the nature and value of the programs.

Leadership in the Community and State

Even greater efforts will be required in the exercise of leadership in the external environment. Much like medical doctors who advise and prescribe on the basis of their expertise, but leave to patients the decision whether to follow that advice or prescription, professional educators have responsibility for advising and prescribing what they have identified as the most useful educational activities. While lay governing boards, citizens groups, and legislators retain the clear option to reject such leadership from the profession or to seek second opinions, the professional responsibility for attempting to lead toward informed decisions is clear. Community college leaders work with many constituent groups and governing bodies to formulate important decisions about the college and its mission in general, and community services in particular. Cosand emphasized the need for a community-oriented president who is "comfortable with all elements of the population" (1980, p. 21), but he also made clear that other administrators possess definite responsibilities for leadership within their own spheres of influence. Myran stressed the need for community services leaders to possess an "intimate knowledge of the community and personal contact with key people within the community" (1969, p. 36). He also states the need to build person-to-person contacts, to identify and educate members of the power structure, and to develop solid relationships with persons in key positions. Considerable time and energy, including making personalized contacts, will be essential to gain opportunities to influence policymaking.

In addition, community services leaders can work with small and large groups to develop community consensus and to gain commitments from community leaders. Perhaps the most effective means for developing the essential community ties is through a citizens' advisory

council, described earlier in this chapter, which would be composed of representatives of a variety of agencies, businesses, schools, and citizens' groups. The community services advisory council could serve a variety of functions from aiding with identification of needs to determining how those needs can best be met and who should serve them. The council can become an effective resource for interagency cooperation (Sullins and Hoerner, 1977) as well as a nucleus of citizens who are informed about, agree with, and are committed to the various elements of a community services program.

Similar to the college committee on community services, the community advisory council should serve substantive purposes, and members should be informed of the disposition of recommendations and suggestions that they have formulated. They should be provided with opportunities to become thoroughly informed about community services and its potential through reading programs, reports, and conference participation outlines similar to those provided to the college committee members. Council members should serve sufficiently lengthy terms to become knowledgeable about the potential for community services programs, should build trust between the college and the various agencies represented, and should contribute to the development of the appropriate programs for the community.

A few of the community policymaking bodies with which community services leaders must be concerned include the college board, curriculum advisory committees, town councils and county commissions, school boards, social service and health agency boards, industrial development commissions, and planning commissions. The decisions of those and other community groups often criticize the role of the college when determining local funding levels, services to be provided and by whom, and interrelationships between agencies and the college.

The task of providing leadership to gain cooperation and support from those groups would be overwhelming without a well-conceived plan of action. Cosand insisted that "the president of the college with assistance from the board, staff, and students must plan and develop a strong program of education for the political forces which comprise the decision makers in the local, state, and federal governments" (1980, p. 32). Much like the negative reaction that may be expected from faculty who are targets of sporadic and evangelistic presentation, community leaders will require continuous and consistent development to build trust, acceptance of ideas, and movement toward consensus about the mission. The need for continuous development is a more critical consideration for community leaders than for faculty because of the inherent turnover among the former due to limited terms of office, whether by appointment or by elections.

The unifying theme for communtly services proposed earlier--citizenship education--offers significant potential for the leaders to make their case in the community. The community benefits of effective citizenship development are clear whether they lead to increased activity of citizens in the political process; improved financial stability; more productive use of leisure; better mental, emotional and physical health; or increased cultural activities. Convincing local policymakers of the worth of such programs should be made easier by the citizenship education theme. Community services leaders should be able to achieve sufficient community commitment so that local political bodies view the programs as meriting fiscal support.

At the state level community services leaders have a number of important groups upon which they should target their efforts to influence decisions and policies. Martorana and Smutz reported on their 1982 study of the impact of growing interest in the adult learner on state

legislators and state-level postsecondary education officials; they concluded that the interest in lifelong learning is not nearly as high among influential persons as it is among the scholars and leaders of those specific components of education. They stated that "unless and until professional educators . . . do a better job of convincing those responsible for setting public policy of the meaning and importance of lifelong learning, little support for the idea in the public policy realm can be expected" (1982, p. 6).

Leadership efforts by presidents, community services directors, board members, and state directors and chancellors must be well orchestrated to insure that consistent and coherent signals are sent to the state policymakers. Cosand's call for a "strong, ongoing program of education" (1980, p. 32) is at least as essential in the capitals as it is in the communities. He argued for educational programs that would eradicate rumors, inaccuracies, and misconceptions, but warned that substantial efforts will be required. Community services leaders from the colleges and the state offices will be required to establish continuous relationships with state policymakers to build trust and to work toward gaining acknowledgment of the benefits of community services programming as legitimate efforts that merit taxpayer support. When legislators visit the college(s) in their home district, they must hear the same stories and pleas that they hear when they return to the capital and compare notes with fellow senators and representatives who visited their own colleges. A clearly defined plan of action, a unifying theme that emphasizes the public benefits of community services, a continuous and consistent effort to educate policymakers, and a great deal of work with the various influential persons in the capital can produce a degree of appreciation and support that does not currently exist.

Conclusion

It is now clear that community college presidents, community services administrators, state directors and chancellors, and other key proponents of the community services function must extract themselves from the morass of management detail and apply themselves to substantive leadership at all levels. They must strive to influence members of the college community who are involved in governance of the college and those who are engrossed in implementing the programs of the college. They must also endeavor to influence those persons outside the college who are involved in making decisions and setting policies that govern the college, either directly or indirectly. Their leadership must be determined by well-conceived plans that include strategies for continuous and consistent education of those who will ultimately determine the success of community services. And, they must gain consensus and commitment for communtiy services around a unifying theme--such as that proposed by Boyer and Hechinger (1981) and supported by us--namely, citizenship education.

Chapter 6
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the preface to this monograph we referred to our own beginnings in the community college movement. All three of us began work in the community college in the 1960s. The historian among us is quick to point out that people are products of their environment and all too frequently captives to their history. We plead guilty to having our thoughts and beliefs--and yes, our commitments--colored by our early experiences in the community college during those years of rapid and exciting expansion.

In the intervening decade or so since our introduction to--and induction into--the community college, we have seen a number of changes in the community college, most of them positive but some of them potentially damaging. One of these negative changes is at least the beginnings of an erosion of the community college's comprehensive mission. Community services is not alone in being threatened. Budget reductions threaten "the open door" by causing imposition of enrollment ceilings in some states. The college transfer function, according to some (Lombardi, 1978a, for example), has been forced into a minor role by other, more popular (in the enrollment sense) missions. Four-year colleges and universities increasingly are offering occupational programs of less than baccalaureate level. Richardson and Leslie (1980) devoted an entire monograph to a thoughtful discussion of the problem of finding requisite funds to finance comprehensiveness.

Throughout this monograph we have attempted to reinforce the central role of community services in a truly comprehensive community college. The realist in each of us recognizes that public tax dollars will

probably never be available in sufficient quantities for the community college to be "all things to all people." The idealist that lingers remains convinced that, although resources are limited, the community college, perhaps by filling the nexus or linking role that Gleazer (1980) advocates, can at least see that "all things" are done.

If community services is to retain its frontline status, we are convinced that consensus must be reached as to the proper role of community services in the overall mission of the community college. Then the community services leadership, at all levels, must seek a recommitment to that role. Failure to do so will likely result in indecision as to direction, reactive programming, a restricted clientele and stopgap funding, hardly the hallmark of a vital component of the community college.

Based upon our review and analyses, we propose the following recommendations for consideration.

(1) Community services leaders should acquire and maintain a thorough knowledge of the historical perspective for the community services function. They should be sensitive to and should understand the historical development of community services in American higher education. The land-grant colleges, the Chautauqua movement, extension programs, the early two-year colleges, all provide a history of public/community service.

As those leaders labor to achieve greater support for their efforts and the programs they value, it will be helpful to couch their statements of appeal and their claims for legitimacy in the context of historical antecedents. Not only should such efforts engender more immediate acceptability among traditionalists but the managers would gain strength in knowing they are not fighting new wars or walking untrod ground.

(2) Community college leaders should establish as a first priority clarification of the college's mission including the appropriate placement of each of its attendant functions (especially community services). The problem of adequate financial support may well be more related to mission ambiguity than to budgets and resources. In a recent field test of a goals inventory developed by the Educational Testing Service, Cross (1981b) found that a sample of community college faculty, administrators, trustees, students and community members ranked community services no higher than seventeenth of twenty possible goal choices. Only cultural/aesthetic awareness and social criticism ranked consistently lower in priority (p. 115). As additional support for the notion that mission ambiguity is a major problem, Breneman and Nelson (1981) state: "Our interviews with state officials . . . revealed widespread disagreement over the value of various parts of the two-year college mission, such as noncredit courses and community service activities, and an unwillingness to accept these broad mission statements as a binding expression of the state's interest in and responsibility for community college education" (p. 162). Until consensus about the college mission and its integral components is reached, widespread commitment from within the college or among policymakers is unlikely to follow.

(3) Community college leaders should include, as an integral effort in mission clarification, agreement upon an operational definition of community services. Ambiguity surrounds not only the mission of the community college and the role of community services within that mission, but also the very definition of community services. Nowhere is this more apparent than in questions about what is fundable and what is not. Some states think solely in terms of credit/noncredit; others ignore that distinction entirely. Some states include Adult Basic

Education and General Education Development activities; others relegate these functions either to the secondary schools or to another budget or program category. In some states remedial and certain types of vocational courses are included in community services; in others these programs stand alone.

The problem of definition is not new. However, until we in the profession--indeed, even within the subspeciality of community services--can speak the same language, it is unreasonable to expect faculty, other administrators, and, perhaps most importantly, lay policymakers to understand the mission and our needs. Without that understanding and agreement, at least within each state if not nationally, neither commitment nor funding is likely to follow. What we suggest is a definition which is broad enough to allow for individual community and college differences but which is not so vague as to be meaningless.

(4) Community college leaders should develop a uniform reporting system that fosters the collection of data in both a format and in units of measure that are useful to policymakers. Part of the confusion surrounding the status and the funding of community services programs can be attributed to a lack of uniform reporting procedures regarding enrollment or participation. While credit enrollments are typically reported either as unduplicated headcount or FTE, community services enrollment reports take many forms. The imprecision which marks these data is partly responsible for the reluctance of legislators and others to provide adequate funding. As long as some colleges report only students who officially enroll in a formal activity and others count heads at rock concerts and art exhibits, it is a small wonder that decision makers have little confidence in our unit of measure for the purpose of policy decisions.

(5) Community services leaders should emphasize a coherent, curriculum-based program of services and activities organized, where possible and feasible, around a common theme. This recommendation is not intended to imply that community services offerings should all be credit-generating or course-bound. On the contrary, the widest range of activities is encouraged. Nor is it intended to inhibit the community services programmer in responding or reacting to an isolated community need. Rather it suggests that community services should be more than an unconnected series of responses, no matter how valid each response, to an equally unrelated series of personal or community problems or issues.

The specific unifying theme around which the program is designed--whether it be civic literacy as suggested by Boyer and Hechinger (1981) and which appears to be a worthy topic to use--is less important than that there be a theme appropriate to the community. Some communities may rally around a program which is oriented toward energy, others may be more concerned about water or land usage, still others may face problems of an economic nature such as unemployment, poverty, even hunger. And, of course, the curriculum of the college is a major factor in identifying the primary area of emphasis. Parnell (1982) speaks of the need for the community services program to "flow from the curriculum." We have tried not only to reinforce that notion but also to cite some of the advantages, building faculty support, for example, of such an approach.

Nothing in this recommendation suggests that colleges, through their community services programs, should not tackle social problems and issues. Indeed, each of the themes we have suggested represents such problems. We suggest, however, that the colleges' contribution to these issues be educational in nature and

that other community agencies be encouraged to deal with the noneducational aspects of the problem.

(6) The funding of community services should become an integral part of the community college budget just as any other of the colleges' programs. It is unlikely that we will experience major increases in state funding for community services activities until the issues of mission and definition are resolved. Even then, the general level of funding for community services activities is not likely to reach the level of support presently enjoyed in a few states. The North Carolina model seems to use a reasonable goal; i.e., funding at 40-50 percent of that provided for regular credit programs. Alternatively, a solution might be an extension of Florida's cost-based approach but with the monies becoming part of the funding formula rather than a separate fund subject to the annual caprice of the legislature.

We are not prepared to accept the "efficiency" argument[18] of Breneman and Nelson (1981) that community services activities represent consumption rather than investment benefits. We believe the preceding recommendations suggest ways in which the community services program unarguably represents a public as well as a private good and, thus, is worthy, even in terms of economic theory, of tax support.

We do support the argument for increased local support of community services however. But rather than the term "local support" becoming a euphemism for "user fees," we urge the development of additional sources of local funding. In states where local tax support is available, the argument for support should be made persuasively and compellingly. In other communities, foundation or other sources should be aggressively pursued. And, of course, just as tuition has become a fact of life, reasonable user fees should be collected.

(7) Community college leaders at all levels should assume an increasingly active leadership stance within their colleges, communities, and state capitals to create improved understanding and acceptance of the community services function and to marshall support that guarantees its place within the college's overall mission. Community college presidents and community services administrators must develop a unified effort to improve local acceptance and support for community services programs within their colleges and their communities. They must acquire a clear sense of direction and achieve consensus among themselves and then work to gain full acceptance among college faculty and staff members and among community leaders and policymakers. We need confident leaders who are sensitive to the negative images of some elements of current programs and who will eschew programs, courses, and activities that detract from the success of programs. Parnell (1982) has called for increased emphasis on program excellence and greater sensitivity to public interests to avoid the "nemesis of belly dancing." Effective leaders will heed his advice as they labor to achieve widespread consensus about the nature and value of their programs to garner commitment from college and staff as well as from community and state policymakers, including the aggressive pursuit of an adequate level of funding.

FOOTNOTES

1. Public service, community services, and service to the community are terms used to describe the idea of service to the nation at the local, state, and national levels.

2. Harper is important to this discussion not only because of his influence on the extension movement and his founding of the University of Chicago but also because he is considered by many people as the "father of the junior college" in America.

3. The launching of the "Wisconsin Idea" is cited by Arthur Levine in his Handbook on Undergraduate Curriculum (Jossey-Bass, 1978) as one of twelve salient events in the history of curriculum development in the United States.

4. This chapter is an expanded version of an article published previously by George B. Vaughan entitled "Community Services and the Community College: Reestablishing the Mission" in the Community Services Catalyst, Spring 1981, 11 (2): 4-10.

5. Cross, in Adults as Learners, discusses barriers to learning. Among the barriers are the amount of time required to get a degree, and not knowing what to take or where learning will lead. Many of these barriers could be lowered through careful program planning.

6. For a brief but incisive discussion of the Cross and Aslanian and Brickell books, see Lawrence R. Murphy, "Adults in College: Promise or Reality? An Essay Review," Review of Higher Education, 1982, 5 (3): 169-175.

7. The role of the community college in teaching an understanding of and appreciation for American democracy remains a vital one, however. Indeed, the "back to basics" movement in education is having an impact on citizenship education. For example, the 1982 session of the Virginia General Assembly mandated that public schools emphasize the citizenship responsibilities inherent in the U.S. Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom and the Virginia Declaration of Rights.

8. There is developing, as this list implies, a vast literature on reduced or steady-state resources which has implications for institutional management. This list includes only books and monographs and ignores the substantial amount of periodical literature on this topic. While many of the resources listed are directed toward the four-year college or university, the principles involved and the lessons to be learned are frighteningly similar.

Alfred, R.L. (Ed.) New Directions for Community Colleges: Coping with Reduced Resources, no. 22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Cooke, A.L. (Ed.) New Directions for Institutional Research: Planning National Retrenchment, no. 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Mayhew, L.B. Surviving the Eighties. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Mingle, J.R., et al. Challenges of Retrenchment. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Mortimer, K.P., & Tierney, M.L. The Three "R's" of the Eighties: Reduction Reallocation and Retrenchment. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education; George Washington University; and ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1979. (ED 172 642)

Stauffer, T.M. (Ed.) Beyond the Falling Sky: Surmounting Pressures on Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1981.

Stewart, C.T., & Harvey, T.R. (Eds.) New Directions for Higher Education: Strategies for Significant Survival, no. 12. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

9. See, for example, Breneman and Nelson (1981), Chapter 3.

10. In both Massachusetts and Washington, all or part of student tuition monies are counted as part of the state appropriation.

11. Those interested in a more detailed treatment of types of financing plans may wish to consult Breneman and Nelson (1981), especially Chapter 5; Wattenbarger and Cage (1974), especially pp. 75-100; and Garms (1977), especially Appendix Three.

12. Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee.

13. Although Iowa is listed by ECS as a formula state, a description of the funding process could more nearly be described as incremental.

14. Formula states who do not include community services in their formula are: Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Hawaii*, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan*, Minnesota*, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, (both the SUNY and CUNY systems), Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon*, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin. States marked with an asterisk did not furnish data directly to ECS. The ECS report contained partial data on these states which were collected from various public sources.

15. Florida ranks fourth in community service enrollments behind North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Iowa.

16. States which utilize the negotiated budget process include Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Maine, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

17. In the context of this discussion, direct costs are defined as salary costs required for the instructors plus necessary supplies and materials consumed during the course of the activity; e.g., fabric in an upholstery class, paint and canvas in an oil painting class, etc. Indirect costs include printing, advertising, administrative costs, amintenance, utilities, and similar support expenditures.

18. See especially their Chapter 2 and pages 184-187.

REFERENCES

Arizona State Community College System. An Overview of Community Services Education. Phoenix: State Board of Directors for Community Colleges, 1982.

Aslanian, C.B., & Brickell, H.M. Americans in Transition: Life Changes as Reasons for Adult Learning. New York: New York Future Directions for a Learning Society, College Entrance Examination Board, 1980. (ED 195 687)

Atwell, C.A., & Sullins, W.R. "Financing Community Services: A Major Dilemma." Community Services Catalyst, Fall 1977, 8 (1): 10-12.

Bailey, S.K. "Coping with the Crises of Funding, Standards, and Purposes: An Expanded Role for Trustees." Change, May/June 1982, 14 (3): 24-28.

Barnard, C.A. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Bennis, W. The Leaning Ivory Tower. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Blum, J.M., Morgan, C.B., Schlesinger, A.M., Jr., Stampp, K.M., & Woodward, C.V. The National Experience: A History of the United States. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1963.

Bogue, J.P. The Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Boyer, E.L., & Hechinger, F.M. Higher Learning in the Nation's Service. A Carnegie Foundation Essay. Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1981. (ED 212 206)

Brawer, F.B. Familiar Functions in New Containers: Classifying Community Education. Topical Paper No. 71. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1980. (ED 187 412)

Breneman, D.W., & Nelson, S.C. Financing Community Colleges: An Economic Perspective. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1981. (ED 211 151)

Brubacher, J.S., & Rudy, W. Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities, 1636-1968. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "21 Million Adults Found Taking Part in Continuing Education Programs," May 5, 1982, 24 (10): 10.

Cohen, A.M. "The Twilight Future of a Function." Community Services Catalyst, Fall 1972, 3 (2): 7-16.

Cohen, A.M., & Brawer, F.B. The American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Cosand, J.P. Perspective: Community Colleges in the 1980s. "Horizons Issues" Monograph Series. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges; Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges; and Council of Universities and Colleges, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1980. (ED 178 146)

Cross, K.P. Adults as Learners. Increasing Participation and Facilitating Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981a.

Cross, K.P. "Community Colleges on the Plateau." Journal of Higher Education. March/April 1981b, 52 (2): 113-123.

Dodds, H.W. The Academic President--Educator or Caretaker? New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Dougherty, V., Hyde, W., & Van De Water, G. Community College Finance at a Glance 1981-1982. Denver: Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States, 1982.

Eells, W.C. The Junior College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931.

Evans, A.H. "The Funding of Community Services." Community Services Catalyst, Spring 1973, 3 (3): 17-22.

Flanagan, G.J. The One-College Concept and Continuing Education: The Process of Change from Peripheral Status to Full Integration. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education, Seattle, Wash., October 11-14, 1981. (ED 208 919). (The quotation is from the abstract by Karen Lefever, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Los Angeles, 1981.

Garms, W.I. Financing Community Colleges. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1977.

Gilder, J. "Lifelong Education: The Critical Policy Questions." In B. Heermann and others (Eds.), New Directions for Community Colleges: Serving Lifelong Learners, no. 29. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Glass, M.R., & Andrew, L.D. "Continuing Education: What Do Key Community College Administrators Think?" Community Services Catalyst, Spring/Summer 1979, 9 (2): 11-14.

Gleazer, E.J., Jr. The Community College: Values, Vision & Vitality. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1980. (ED 187 364)

Gollattscheck, J.F., Harlacher, E.L., Roberts, E., & Wygal, B.R. College Leadership for Community Renewal. Beyond Community-Based Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Gould, J.E. The Chautauqua Movement: An Episode in the Continuing American Revolution. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1961.

Green, D.W., Shepherd, J., & Craft, C., Jr. "Community Services in a Semirural Community College." In M.A. Marty (Ed.), New Directions for Community Colleges: Responding to New Missions, no. 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Harrington, F.H. The Future of Adult Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Harlacher, E.L. The Community Dimension of the Community College. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Havighurst, R.J. "Social Change and the Community College." In W.K. Ogilvie & M.R. Raines (Eds.), Perspective on the Community - Junior College: Selected Readings. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971.

Higher Education for American Democracy. A Report for the President's Commission on Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947.

Hofstadter, R. & Hardy, C.D. The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Ireland, J. "The Role of Community Services in a Time of Fiscal Constraint: A California Perspective." Community Services Catalyst, Summer 1982, 12 (3): 11-15.

Ireland, J., & Feuers-Jones, A. The Status and Future of Community Services in the Los Angeles Community College District. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Community College District, 1980. (192 838)

Jackson, G.A. "Community Colleges in the Post-Proposition 13 Era: Institutional Responses to Tax Limitation." Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, January-March 1981, 5 (2): 141-166.

Johnson, B.L. "Critical Community College Problems Then and Now: The Mid-60's and the Late 70's." Community College Frontiers, Summer 1979, 7 (4): 8-14.

Karvelis, D.S. "A Definition, Philosophy and Self-Assessment Framework for Community Colleges." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate School

of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, 1978.

Keim, W.A. "A Dynamic Definition of Service." In H.M. Holcomb (Ed.), New Directions for Community Colleges: Reaching Out Through Community Service, no. 14. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Kintzer, F.C. Proposition 13: Implications for Community Colleges. Topical Paper No. 72. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1980. (ED 188 711)

Koos, L.V. The Junior-College Movement. New York: Ginn, 1925.

Lombardi, J. Community Education: Threat to College Status? Topical Paper No. 68. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1978a. (ED 156 296)

Lombardi, J. "Community Services: A Status Report." Community Services Catalyst, Spring 1978b, 8 (2): 14-17.

Martorana, S.V., & Smutz, W.D. "Coordination of Lifelong Learning Programs: Some Perspectives of Community College State Directors." Community Services Catalyst, Spring 1982, 12 (1): 2-6.

Myran, G.A. Community Services in the Community College. Washington, D.C.: Community Services Project, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969. (ED 037 202)

National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education. A Special Report to the President and the Congress of the United States by the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education. Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, 1979. (ED 179 814)

Parnell, D. "Will Belly Dancing be Our Nemesis?" Community Services Catalyst, Summer 1982, 12 (3): 4-5.

90

Pullias, E.V. "A Historical Perspective: The Land Grant Concept and the Community College Philosophy." Community College Review, June 1975, 3 (1): 45-49.

Richardson, R.C., Jr., & Leslie, L.L. The Impossible Dream? Financing Community College's Evolving Mission. "Horizons Issues" Monograph Series. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges; Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges; and Council of Universities and Colleges, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1980. (ED 197 783)

Ross, E.D. Democracy's College: The Land-Grant Movement in the Formative Stage. Ames: The Iowa State College Press, 1942.

Rudolph, F. The American College and University: A History. New York: Knopf, 1962.

Stoke, H.W. The American College President. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

Sullins, W.R. & Hoerner, J.L. "Community Services Advisory Committees: Effective Resources for Interagency Cooperation." Community Services Catalyst, Spring 1977, 7 (1): 24-27.

Vaughan, G.B. "Thomas Jefferson, the Community College and the Pursuit of Education." Community College Frontiers, Summer 1980, 8 (4): 4-10.

Vaughan, G.B. "A President's Formula: Involving the Entire Faculty in Community Services." Community College Review, March 1975, 2 (4): 48-52.

Wattenbarger, J.L., & Cage, B.N. More Money for More Opportunity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Wattenbarger, J.L., & Bibby, P.J. Financing Community Colleges, 1981. Gainesville: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1981. (ED 207 631)

Yarrington, R. "Finding the Funds." In H.M. Holcomb (Ed.), New Directions for Community Colleges:

Reaching Out Through Community Service, no. 14. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Yarrington, R. (Ed.). 1982 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1982.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

OCT 1 1982